Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-077
Monday
22 April 1991

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-91-077 *22 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: • indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

BULGARIA

Popov: Cooperative Farms Blocking Land Reform *[SVOBODEN NAROD 16 Apr]* 1
Tomov on Problems Blocking Reform *[BTA]* 1
Poll Indicates Support for Reform *[BTA]* 1
Industry Minister Ludzhev on Privatization Plans *[DUMA 17 Apr]* 1
Pushkarov on Need To Break Up Monopolies *[DUMA 17 Apr]* 2
SDS Issues Political Appeal at Sofia Rally *[DEMOKRATSIYA 16 Apr]* 2
SDS-Center Presents Political Declaration *[BTA]* 3
Lilov Sees Political Realignment Before Election *[BTA]* 3
Opposition MP's Skeptical on Early Election *[BTA]* 4
BZNS Congress Ends; June Election Requested *[BTA]* 4
SDS Leader Remarks on Communist 'Infiltration' *[POGLED 15 Apr]* 4
Cabinet Approves Order on Seized Properties *[DUMA 16 Apr]* 5
MP's To Sign Statements on Chernobyl Aftermath *[BTA]* 5
Kalugin: Ex-Interior Minister Worked for KGB *[BTA]* 6
Zhelev Agrees To Open Personal Police File *[BTA]* 6
Zhivkov Hospitalized; Trial Interrupted *[BTA]* 6
Prime Minister Popov Holds Talks With Loncar *[BTA]* 6
Loncar Meets With Vulkov *[BTA]* 7
Loncar Meets Todorov, BSP Official *[Sofia Radio]* 7
Zhelev, Hungary's Goncz View Relations *[BTA]* 7
Paris Club Agrees To Reschedule Debts *[BTA]* 7

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Slovak National Council Issues Statement *[Bratislava Radio]* 8
Meciar's Departure From Office Called 'Necessary' *[CTK]* 9
Carnogursky Interviewed on Slovak Political Scene *[VEREJNOST 15 Apr]* 9
Prime Minister Calfa Queried on Economic Reform *[Prague Radio]* 13

HUNGARY

Soviet Nuclear Arms 'Had Been Stored' in Country *[Budapest Radio]* 15
Croatian President Tudjman Pays Official Visit 15
Arrives, Opens Talks With Antall *[MTI]* 15
Bilateral Relations Discussed *[MTI]* 15
Cooperation Memorandum Approved *[MTI]* 16
Arms Deal, Yugoslav Future Discussed *[Budapest Radio]* 16
Slovak Prime Minister Meciar Pays Visit *[MTI]* 17
Interviewed Upon Arrival *[Budapest Radio]* 17
Goncz Interviewed on Foreign, Domestic Relations *[Budapest Radio]* 17
Future of Government Coalition Questioned *[Budapest Radio]* 20
SZDSZ on Suggested Party Approach, Governing *[MAGYAR HIRLAP 13 Apr]* 20

POLAND

Walesa Queried on Country's Political Development *[ZYCIE WARSZAWY 16 Apr]* 22
Sejm Commission Establishes Draft Election Rules *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 17 Apr]* 24
Bielecki Meets With Sejm Agriculture Commission *[Warsaw TV]* 24
PSL Deputy Withdraws No Confidence Motion *[Warsaw Radio]* 25
Experts Find No Chemical Weapons in Soviet Units *[PAP]* 25

He stated that new efficient managements have to be appointed for companies as soon as possible.

It turned out, Ludzhev stated, that our proposal on canceling the moratorium had gone missing in the Grand National Assembly. We, therefore, submitted a duplicate proposal to the legislature's legal department, and they promised that it would go through on Thursday, he explained.

Pushkarov on Need To Break Up Monopolies

AU1904195591 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 17 Apr 91 p 1

[Text] We have already received 200 requests for the breaking up of monopoly companies, Minister [of Industry, Trade, and Services] Pushkarov stated at a meeting with 40 representatives of municipalities throughout the country. The minister made this point to prove that the process of demonopolization was a spontaneous one.

The aim of the meeting was to refine the position of the government and the municipal leaderships regarding demonopolization and privatization problems, to develop programs, and fix deadlines for their implementation.

The small privatization can begin in trade, services, and tourism right now, stated Minister Pushkarov. According to Dimitur Ludzhev, the most important thing at the moment is to define the status of the various enterprises and the forms for disposing of their property, the methods for escaping from the clutches of the local monopolists, and the localization of municipal property. These problems must form part of the municipal privatization programs.

The municipal leaderships must first review the fate of municipal companies, and then decide which facilities can be sold, and how the facilities that cannot be sold will be managed, stated Deputy Minister Valeri Tsekov. Municipal companies make up about 90 percent of the businesses in trade and services, and the small privatization is primarily directed toward these spheres.

The municipal leaders stressed that the illiteracy of the municipal leaderships, the lack of clarity regarding the term monopolist, and poorly identified problems relating to ownership were the main obstacles to demonopolization and privatization. Ludzhev promised that the municipal leaderships would soon be receiving a letter offering advice.

In Ludzhev's opinion, the call "Brothers, do not buy!" should be replaced by the one "Brothers, produce!" Otherwise, the reform would hang in the air. He referred to information from a sociological study that shows that most of the population maintains a passive position.

SDS Issues Political Appeal at Sofia Rally

AU2104165291 Sofia DEMOKRATSIYA in Bulgarian 16 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

["Appeal for Setting Up Citizens SDS Committees" issued in Sofia on 15 April]

[Text] Bulgarian citizens, not a single essential change has been implemented since the 10 November coup, conducted with Moscow's blessing. New illusions replaced the old ones.

It is not true that holding legislative and municipal elections soon will slow down or hamper the economic reform. The truth is that the reform is doomed to fail in the trap of the nomenklatura, which still rules us. The truth is that we will not receive any significant foreign aid, so badly needed by us, as long as the nomenklatura continues to rule. The truth is that the majority in the Grand National Assembly tries to transfer Bulgaria's national wealth to the hands of the intact and slightly disguised red nomenklatura. The truth is that the sociocommunists will not implement any privatization or reprivatization, and will not return the agrarian land to its owners.

If the political situation remains unchanged soon there will be no Bulgarian political opposition. The opportunism of certain party leaders undermined the faith of many thinking people. We must not let Bulgaria be compared only to Romania and Albania. We must not participate any longer in the sinister script especially prepared for those countries.

Stemming from the current political and economic realities, from the assessment of the deliberate undermining of the political agreement that stabilized the country's communist system that was condemned by history;

—decisively condemning the attempts of the ruling sociocommunists to reject the guilt for the national catastrophe;

—and wishing to clear the road of the economic reform and clean Bulgaria's face from the shame, the democratic organizations—members and associates of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], as well as the SDS regional structures, the SDS Sofia City Consultative Council, the Alternative Socialist Party, the "Civic Initiative" Movement, The Radical-Democratic Party, the United Democratic Center, the Independent Human Rights Association, the Bulgarian Democratic Forum, the Democratic Party, the New Social Democratic Party, and the Christian Democratic Union of the "Salvation" Christian Alliance appeal to their members and supporters, the members and supporters of other opposition forces, and all those who share their ideas to immediately and finally eliminate the communist and neocommunist structures and trends in Bulgaria and the support and participate in setting up SDS Civic Committees throughout the country!

The SDS City Council does not oppose the acting SDS structures.

The basic goals of the SDS Civil Committee are as follows:

1. Holding legislative elections by June. Assuming the political power and implementing the SDS program ideas.

2. Organizing a trial for the main culprits of the national catastrophe. Conducting a judicial investigation and confiscating their property.

3. Confiscating the property of the heirs of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Dimitrov Komsomol, the Fatherland Front, and Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship Association, and the other official organizations and all their companies. Utilizing the confiscated means for the purchase agrarian equipment for the agricultural workers and for supporting the socially deprived strata.

4. Returning the national wealth that has been transferred abroad.

5. Locating, safeguarding, and publishing the archive documents. Collecting evidence for crimes that have been committed.

6. Establishing a strict public control over the processes of privatization and returning the agrarian land, which must be rapidly conducted.

7. Renewing and strengthening the united opposition and removing the compromised or discredited members of the SDS national and regional leaderships.

This is the only road toward restoring our motherland as a free, rich, and democratic country, which has a worthy place in modern human civilization.

We must justify the hopes of the people who believe in us! We must guarantee the implementation of our social programs and save the democratic reform! We must relinquish the narrow party interests, bias, and personal ambitions! We must unite in a national movement in the name of the great goal, the future of our motherland! We appeal to all deputies, politicians, public figures, and intellectuals who share our basic goals to help us!

The National Organizational Committee elected by the constituent organizations, assumes the obligation to prepare and publish the movement's basic documents. After forming the local SDS civic committees it will organize and conduct a national conference for discussing and adopting the charter and the other preparatory documents, as well as for electing the central leadership.

Sofia, 15 April 1991.

The "Podkrepa" Labor confederation, the Bulgarian Free Union (United States), the "Dialogue Foundation (France), and the "St. Ivan Rilski" Bulgarian Religious Community in Exile (Germany), joined the appeal.

SDS-Center Presents Political Declaration

AU1904100091 Sofia BTA in English 0850 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA) With the establishment of the SDS—Centre, the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian National Agrarian Union and the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party want to put the democratic forces' house in order, the SDS—Centre says in a declaration published in "DEMOKRATSIYA." The declaration analyses the causes for the disastrous condition of Bulgaria and stresses the responsibility of the Bulgarian Communist (renamed Socialist) Party, pointing out that with its "left-wing" and "right-wing" speculations the BSP is seeking to drive a wedge into the democratic opposition.

The SDS—Centre wants parliamentary elections as soon as possible but at the same time it calls on the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS) to stand up for the adoption of a democratic constitution and the key laws of the reform by the incumbent parliament and disagrees with "emotional calls for an immediate walk-out which delay the process of replacing the system." The SDS—Centre is not a new organizational structure and it will work for the consolidation of the democratic forces, the declaration says.

Lilov Sees Political Realignment Before Election

AU1904092191 Sofia BTA in English 2219 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—There will be probably a realignment of political forces in Bulgaria on the eve of the next parliamentary elections, predicts Mr. Aleksandur Lilov, chairman of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP). He told supporters of the Socialist (formerly Communist) Party in Plovdiv: "I can't assert that a new left-wing political coalition will be formed but the chances are much better than at the previous elections." Mr. Lilov did not specify which parties and organizations might enter a left-wing group "with similar views of Bulgaria's democratization," apart from the Young Socialists League, which had declared its wish to coalesce with the BSP.

The two largest opposition parties, the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party and the Nikola Petkov Agrarian Party, both affiliated to the Union of Democratic Forces (SDS), recently formed the SDS—Centre and declared themselves against what they see as extreme right forces in the SDS. The BSP also speaks about an ultra right threat. Top-ranking BSP functionaries have expressed satisfaction with the formation of the SDS—Centre.

The Socialists' leader also discussed the intentions of the Podkrepa Labour Confederation to press for the dissolution of parliament and for the dismissal of some government ministers.

Opposition MP's Skeptical on Early Election

AU1904093091 Sofia BTA in English 2211 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—A scandal is likely to erupt these days over the police files of MP's who used to be secret police informers under the former regime.

However, information is already leaking out and some thirty MP's are frequently mentioned in the lobby as possible full-time and part-time informers of the now disbanded political police.

It transpired today that the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry is ready with its report. Next Monday the leaders of the parliamentary groups, parliament's Bureau, the Commission of Inquiry and the minister of the interior will decide on the procedure of debating the report.

MP's of different parliamentary factions find it possible that the police files debate may delay parliament's law-making and the debate on the principles of the new Constitution.

Some of the moot problems emerged once again in today's debate on the draft constitution principles. An MP of the Nikola Petkov Agrarian Party lashed out against a pro-monarchy statement by an opposition MP on Tuesday. "Bulgaria is through with the monarchy once and for all," he said. The description of Bulgaria as a social state contained in the draft also drew criticisms.

In a recent resolution on its future work parliament set down the passage of the new constitution as a condition for its self-dissolution and the scheduling of new general elections. However, the full draft of the Constitution is not ready yet. Now even MP's who insisted that parliamentary elections should be held in June agree that this is impracticable. Part of the opposition MP's even doubt that parliamentary elections will be held in the autumn. MP's do not rule out the possibility of local elections preceding the general ones, as the Socialists' parliamentary faction had insisted, while parliamentary elections may be held early next year.

BZNS Congress Ends; June Election Requested

AU2204121191 Sofia BTA in English 1013 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 22 (BTA)—At the three-day congress of the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian Agrarian Party [BZNS] (member of the Union of Democratic Forces) Mr. Milan Drenchev was reelected secretary general. After lively debates yesterday the congress adopted the new program and the constitution of the opposition Agrarian Party.

The congress adopted a resolution in which the delegates appealed to MP's to make all efforts to pass the new constitution by the end of May. Otherwise the congress called on the parliamentary Nikola Petkov BZNS group to walk out of the parliament. The Nikola Petkov BZNS wants early parliamentary elections, the resolution says.

[Words indistinct] of 50, who were a minority at the congress, issued a special declaration. They think the opposition Agrarian Party is in a crisis, and therefore reproached the leadership, consisting mainly of veterans, and demanded its rejuvenation. The group of the young delegates even want age quotas introduced for the leadership and half plus one of the seats for members under the age of 50.

The young representatives require parliamentary elections in June. They insist on a clear stand on the unification of the two existing agrarian parties "without emotions, feelings and memories."

SDS Leader Remarks on Communist 'Infiltration'

AU1904195391 Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian No. 15 15 Apr 91 pp 8, 9

[Mariana Nikolova report on statement by Filip Dimitrov, chairman of the Union of Democratic Forces Coordinating Council, at meeting with Federation of Independent Students Associations students held at the Sofia Karl Marx Hall; date not given: "A Bulgarian Version of the 'Silver' Plan"]

[Text] Last week the Federation of Independent Students Associations organized a meeting with Finance Minister Ivan Kostov and Filip Dimitrov, chairman of the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] Coordinating Council. Incidentally, the meeting was held at the Karl Marx Hall and the first part proceeded in darkness and without functioning microphones as a result of the periodic electric power cuts. However, the electricity shortage did not prevent the audience from attentively listening to the speakers and from asking them numerous questions. A POGLED reporter excerpted Mr. Dimitrov's most interesting answer dealing with the possible existence of a Bulgarian version of the notorious "Sliver" ["Kili"—title of a book involving infiltration of institutions by communists] Plan that was recently discussed and is related to the infiltration of the opposition by the secret services. Dimitrov stated as follows on the subject:

We could accept the idea that such a trend for infiltration might have existed at the very beginning of the Bulgarian opposition's activities. I would like to cite an example in this respect: Numerous people who had a critical approach to the former regime joined the Glasnost and In Defense of Perestroyka (which has now been renamed Federation of Democracy) clubs. Later on, however, a group of them categorically opposed the establishment of the SDS. Naturally, I cannot claim that all of them were infiltrators, but some of them might have been. As a matter of fact a sharp controversy erupted within the club, which led to its split, as a result of which part of the members joined the united opposition of the SDS.

This suggests that if a similar plan of infiltrating the opposition had existed, it was reduced to absurdity by the very fact that the ammunition was used up at the very moment when the opposition came into existence.

As to my own view, I am inclined to think that the major part of the ammunition, if such really existed in connection with possible infiltration plans, was wasted. This is because approximately six months later a new thesis appeared that was very strongly supported by representatives of the Communist Party. We would like to call it the Topencharov thesis because the Communist press frequently published quotations from a letter allegedly signed by members of the Topencharov family [Topencharov was a well-known Bulgarian journalist and public figure known as an inveterate Stalinist]. I do not know whether the letter was actually written by them, but no one denied it. The more important fact is that the letter in question contained certain ideas and suggestions for dealing with the Bulgarian opposition.

Such ideas could have logically resulted from a new version of the "Sliver" Plan. The ideas in question were based on a new thesis of infiltrating the already existing opposition in the purpose of splitting it. The thesis was focused on a triple objective, namely aimed at the Nikola Petkov Bulgarian National Agrarian Union [BZNS], the ecological movements, and at ambitious young people, in general. The purpose was to separate the Nikola Petkov BZNS from the SDS and antagonize the two groups; to treat the Green Party and Ecoglanost with maximum benevolence that should extend to an invitation for their participation in the government, and last but not least, to "seduce" ambitious young SDS members with highranking posts thus luring them away from the opposition.

I am convinced that this second plan has also failed. Its so-called "climax" was reached in September 1990 when Mr. Lukanov proposed a new cabinet that was supposed to offer eight ministerial posts to members of the opposition, six of which were expected to be filled by representatives of the ecological movements. In the final account, however, the plan was unsuccessful, as the opposition refused to participate in a government, which resulted in the failure of Mr. Lukanov's cabinet and led to a subsequent change of methods related to forming a government. The new cabinet was based on the principle of team work, under which a split was no longer possible.

As a result of all aforementioned circumstances, I could sum up the issue in the following manner: Further scenarios are presumably in the process of being written. Nevertheless, the two former scenarios (one of which I would tentatively call the "Sliver" Plan related to the Glasnost and Perestroyka clubs, and the second we could perhaps call the "post-Sliver" Plan, or the Topencharov scenario), did not achieve the effect desired by their authors.

Cabinet Approves Order on Seized Properties

AU1904091591 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 16 Apr 91 p 1

[Dima Dimitrova report]

[Text] At its 15 April meeting, the government adopted in principle an order that specifies how the properties confiscated and seized in the period from 17 March 1945 to 31 December 1989 will be returned to their former owners pardoned under the amnesty.

The document lists all the laws in respect of which pardons have been granted for crimes committed, mentioning the precise texts in the Law on Defense of the People's Power, the Penal Law, and the Law on Bulgarian Citizenship.

The persons pardoned under the amnesty or their heirs may receive back the same property, be granted property of equivalent value of the same or another kind, or be given monetary compensation. Land will be restored or payment made for it only in the amounts defined under the Law on Ownership and Use of Agricultural Land, while foreign citizens will only be entitled to monetary compensation.

If the confiscated property is now in the possession of state or municipal companies, the latter will return the property. Compensation is to be paid if the property is now in the possession of mixed companies in which the state has a share of less than 50 percent or of third private parties, or if the land has been destroyed, ruined, or rebuilt.

The value of the property is to be calculated at the prices at which the state sells property at the time of the return of the said property.

A two-year period is granted for submitting claims for the return of the confiscated properties, and a large number of claims are expected. It is likely that the state will issue bonds as monetary compensation.

The legal document will be supplemented and will be finally adopted when the National Assembly's Legislative Commission presents its view. Justice Minister Pencho Penev explained that this coordination is necessary because the order lays down the procedure for applying Article 5, Paragraph 2 of the Law on an Amnesty and Return of Confiscated Properties.

MP's To Sign Statements on Chernobyl Aftermath

AU1904092491 Sofia BTA in English 2221 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—Parliament resolved today that MP's should sign a sworn statement that they have not enjoyed special privileges for protection from the effects of the Chernobyl disaster.

The text runs as follows: "I hereby declare that following the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant and until the spring of 1987 neither I nor my family have received restricted information on the risk of the radiation situation, that we have not enjoyed any special treatment either by the Security and Protection Department or by any other state institution, aimed at avoiding the said risk."

There are MP's who were catered for by the Security and Protection Department.

Kalugin: Ex-Interior Minister Worked for KGB

AU1904145691 Sofia BTA in English 1202 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—Bulgaria's former minister of the interior is a KGB agent, Mr. Oleg Kalugin, former chief of the Soviet counterintelligence, said in an interview for the "DIALOG" weekly.

Mr. Kalugin confirms his statements that Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia supplied Palestinians with special weapons and explosives and trained them according to Soviet methods.

The former KGB general dismisses as "sheer absurdity" the allegations about a "Bulgarian connection" in the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul II. According to Mr. Kalugin, the journalist who launched this theory, Mrs. Claire Sterling, has long given it up.

Zhelev Agrees To Open Personal Police File

AU2004154991 Sofia BTA in English 2307 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—"I have consented to making my police file public because otherwise there would have been suspicions as to my political past," President Zhelev told the National Television today in a short statement broadcast in the central TV news.

Dr. Zhelev responded to a call by Bulgarian journalists who insisted that the opening of the police files of the MP's should start with that of the president. Dr. Zhelev said that his decision does not oblige anyone to follow suit. Dr. Zhelev believes that the police files of political and state leaders should be opened to the public because people must know the truth.

The president suggested that the police files of all future election candidates be opened in advance to avoid any possible scandals and pointed out that taking a decision to this effect does not lie within his competency.

According to the Bulgarian television newscaster, all these issues, as well as the problems arising in connection with the police files of the deputies in the National Assembly, will be discussed in parliament on Monday and appropriate decisions will probably be adopted.

Zhivkov Hospitalized; Trial Interrupted

AU1904160591 Sofia BTA in English 1453 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—Former dictator Todor Zhivkov, now defendant in Case No. 1, is in danger of heart attack or brain stroke, a BTA reporter was told. The Zhivkov/Balev trial can be resumed either late next week or on April 29. This week court hearings were adjourned because of former Number One's hypertension and vestibular [as received] system problems.

Todor Zhivkov is kept under medical observation at the Ministry of Interior hospital which issued a direction for a five-day bed-rest.

His attending physician declined to predict Zhivkov's condition.

Zhivkov's blood pressure was critically high and he was endangered by heart attack or brain stroke, according to sources who spoke on conditions of anonymity.

Prime Minister Popov Holds Talks With Loncar

AU2004154591 Sofia BTA in English 2323 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—At today's talks he had with Mr. Budimir Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria's Prime Minister Dimitur Popov announced the government's initiative to set up a Balkan Secretariat in Sofia which would seek to promote closer cooperation between the Balkan countries.

Mr. Popov and Mr. Loncar stated that neither of the two countries had any territorial claims on the other. Mr. Popov and Mr. Loncar discussed the attitude to certain groups of citizens in the two countries in the context of the CSCE resolutions. Mr. Popov said that the government and the political forces in Bulgaria are unanimous on the so-called "third basket' and will stick to the CSCE decisions.

The political forces and the Bulgarian Government, except for some small formations of little public influence, hold the opinion that the rights of all groups of citizens in Bulgaria should be safeguarded. At the same time almost all of them are categorical that the present-state realities should not be subject to revision. The position stated by Mr. Loncar was similar. He underlined that Yugoslavia has no territorial claims on any of the Balkan countries, Bulgaria included, and firmly sticks to the security and cooperation accords.

Mr. Dimitur Popov stressed the goodwill of the Bulgarian Government which seeks to develop good-neighbourly relations with Yugoslavia.

The talks of Mr. Popov and Mr. Loncar lasted an hour more than initially planned. But this does not mean that the talks were difficult, the chief of the government's Press Centre stated.

Loncar Meets With Vulkov

AU1904202091 Sofia BTA in English 1630 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—Bulgaria's Foreign Minister Viktor Vulkov and his Yugoslavian counterpart, Mr. Budimir Loncar, kept their promise of this morning for an open dialogue. They were happy to share this conclusion after the first round of their talks. Probably the dialogue held in the desired atmosphere gave grounds for a second round which was not envisaged in the original schedule.

After a certain standstill in their relations, now both countries declare their readiness for a better and more successful cooperation. The prerequisites for it are the tendencies dominating the social life in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and the European process.

The two foreign ministers also discussed the opportunities for overcoming the stagnation in economic relations. In the recent years trade between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia amounted to about 300 million dollars. Experts believe this amount corresponds neither to the capacities nor the interests of the two countries. Modern forms of cooperation are hardly applied. Joint production amounts to only 5 percent of the two countries' trade.

It is expected that this afternoon Mr. Budimir Loncar will be received by President Zhelyu Zhelev and Prime Minister Dimitur Popov.

Loncar Meets Todorov, BSP Official

AU2004154691 Sofia Domestic Service in Bulgarian 0900 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] A short while ago Grand National Assembly Chairman Nikolay Todorov received Budimir Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of Yugoslavia.

Earlier this morning, the leader of the Yugoslav diplomacy held successive meetings with the leadership of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union and with Aleksandur Lilov, chairman of the Supreme Party Council of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP]. Lilov told our reporter about his satisfaction with the talks and the similarity in the two sides' assessments of the processes of change and democratization in the two countries and in the Balkans.

At lunchtime today, in accordance with the planned program, the second round of official talks begins between Viktor Vulkov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs, and Mr. Loncar. It is expected that Mr. Loncar will give a news conference before his departure from Bulgaria.

Zhelev, Hungary's Goncz View Relations

AU1904160891 Sofia BTA in English 1154 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 19 (BTA)—ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME runs an interview with President of the Republic Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev, granted on his return from an official visit to Hungary yesterday. President Zhelev describes his talks in Budapest as cordial and sincere.

The four documents signed during the visit open opportunities for wide-ranging cooperation based on market principles, and the most important of them, the Declaration on Relations Between Bulgaria and Hungary, lays the groundwork for a treaty on bilateral cooperation, Bulgaria's president believes.

After completing his talks with the Hungarian leaders, in an interview for SVOBODEN NAROD, President Zhelev pointed out the complete identity of views on the CMEA [CEMA]. Just like the Warsaw Treaty this organization should be consigned to history.

Asked whether Hungary "will open the doors of the Visegrad Triangle to Bulgaria," President Arpad Goncz stressed that this is an agreement on cooperation between three countries based on their geographical location. "Naturally, we should also take into account that, apart from these central European structures of cooperation, we have friends living a little farther away with whom we also want to be together. I believe that this will also be true of the regional structures in which Bulgaria will take part in her turn in the Balkan peninsula. Though to a lesser degree, Hungary also has interests in that part of Europe," Mr. Goncz concluded.

Paris Club Agrees To Reschedule Debts

AU1904094091 Sofia BTA in English 2305 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Sofia, April 18 (BTA)—"We are very glad and believe that Bulgaria scored a success," Ms. Mariana Todorova, deputy minister of foreign economic relations, told BTA, commenting on the agreement signed between Bulgaria and the Paris Club under which Bulgaria's long-and medium-term debts will be rescheduled over a ten-year period and the short-term debt will get a preferential treatment.

"This is not a conventional agreement, which goes to show that our official creditors really support this country by making an exception for it," Ms. Todorova stressed.

She took part in the Paris Club meeting on April 17, which discussed Bulgaria's debts to its official creditor governments and agencies which guarantee or insure its export credits.

Slovak National Council Issues Statement

LD1904213891 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1706 GMT 19 Apr 91

["Full text" of a statement adopted by the Presidium of the Slovak National Council (SNR), read to journalists by SNR Deputy Chairman Jan Klepac in Bratislava on 19 April—recorded]

[Text] On the authorization of the Slovak National Council [SNR] Presidium members, interviews were held on 29 March 1991 with the Slovak deputy prime ministers, and the prime minister commented on these issues to the SNR Presidium on 16 April 1991. The SNR Presidium also had at its disposal a report on the implementation of the Slovak government's policy statement. The report was approved by the government on 8 April 1991. On the basis of its findings, the documents presented to it, and its assessment of the state of the economy and society, the SNR Presidium considers the government as a whole as not functional; it considers the existing situation in the government untenable, which means that changes in its composition are needed.

The SNR Presidium bases this stand on the following facts:

Economic development in Slovakia and, above all, the course of the economic reform and its negative social repercussions have today exceeded even the most pessimistic forecasts. The Slovak economy, and its business and enterprises, are falling into a catastrophic state. In its July 1990 policy statement, however, the government stated, and I quote: Complex tasks await us in the economy, and these are linked with high economic efficiency and a commensurate level of social guarantees. There are a number of examples of positive solutions to economic and social problems abroad. The government also went on to say, and I quote: The government's role will no longer be that of the overall management of enterprises. Instead, it will be to create economic balance, stability, and support for economic growth. End of quote. The current rate of enterprise insolvency and redundancy of manufacturing capacity are the direct consequences of the failure to discharge this role.

Let me quote the government's policy statement again: In wages and salaries, the government intends to implement measures to offer businesses the scope to react flexibly to the market situation and to workers' output. At the same time, it intends to ensure that social guarantees are reflected in wages. End of quote. The existing outdated wage regulations, however, are still having a negative effect and they do not reflect workers' output and the market situation. I quote again from the government's policy statement: The government ascribes great importance to the rapid and comprehensive development of banking operations in Slovakia. It expects that more banks will be established, and that foreign banks and financial institutions will be integrated into our money and finance market. End of quote. The SNR Presidium's view is as follows: to date, not a single foreign bank is operating in Slovakia and the development of the banking system is lagging markedly behind current needs and behind the progress in the Czech Republic.

I quote again from the government's policy statement: One of the aims of the government's overall policy will be to deal expeditiously with housing development, as there is a shortage of about 500,000 apartments. This aim calls for the formulation of housing ownership relations and for the development of various forms of enterprise in housing construction [end of quote].

The Presidium takes the following view: The government has still not presented any concept for housing policy.

The government's policy statement also says the following: The government sees it as one of its priority tasks to ensure the balanced development of all areas and regions regardless of their location. The SNR Presidium's view is that the government still has not presented a single specific proposal on regional policy.

The government will focus—I am quoting the policy statement—on tackling the discrepancy between supply and demand for manpower in the job market by promptly establishing a comprehensive network of systems of services to promote employment. Our view: So far only the job centers exist; unemployment is rising more quickly than anyone expected; and the government is not carrying out any active employment policy because it has not drawn up or approved a concept for its structural policy. From this it emerges that the government and its different departments are not carrying out many of the fundamental intentions of the Slovak government's June [as heard] 1990 policy statement.

The report on implementation of the Slovak government's policy statement, presented by the prime minister to the SNR on 12 April 1991, runs counter to a realistic assessment of the overall socioeconomic situation and to the prime minister's comments. The Slovak prime minister made the following comments to the SNR Presidium, and I quote: From the point of view of economic reform, Slovakia does not have an effective economic reform worked out—I admit this, it does not have a program of structural changes, it does not have a program for developing an active market, it does not have an active program for opening up and seeking investment, it has no established program of priorities, and in particular it has no established program for transferring people from the secondary to the tertiary sphere. Mr. Kucerak takes the view that this will be resolved by market forces. My view, and that of many other ministers, is that it cannot be resolved by market forces, there must be regulation, the market will not intervene, and if we leave it to sort itself out, then it will collapse. We have not even established our own priorities, nor our foreign priorities; we have no agreed method for acquiring capital and encouraging competition, nor have we agreed on some of the consequences—those were some quotes from the premier's testimony to the SNR Presidium.

The SNR Presidium finds that in its radical economic reform the government has neglected to implement expeditiously and commensurately those aspects of economic and social development in which there is a clear discrepancy between the Slovak and the Czech Republic, and whose neglect is already negotiable. The different ministries have not worked out concepts to take account of possible developments and seek solutions. The different departments are not coordinated in such a way as to enable the government's economic policy to remain in control of the economy as a whole, and thus prevent its impending collapse.

In the sphere of state administration, the government has not coped; it has let the transformation and reconstruction of the state administration slip out of its hands. It is responsible for the fact that norms on restructuring the state administration are issued late, and are not up to standard. If has failed to manage adequately the demise of the old National Committee structures, and has allowed the establishment of the new state administration structure to be affected by the chaotic influence of both political forces and movements and the vestiges of the surviving communist system. Despite the task it sets in the Slovak government's policy statement not to increase the complement of the administrative structures, the number of state administration employees has risen by more than 1,000. In this regard, the prime minister said that a whole new comprehensive model of state administration needs to be worked out.

In its legislative work, the government is not active enough in making improvements to the legal order. It has not made an analysis of the weakest areas of legislation; it submits individual bills too late and unsystematically. The prime minister's comments in this respect were as follows: Legislative work is carried out badly in our government.

The government's increasing inability to function has been markedly affected by discord within the government between the premier, his deputy prime ministers, and groups of ministers. These are caused by personal and political conflicts as well as differences of views on issues of implementing the economic reform in Slovakia. The prime minister also confirmed that, and I quote: I think that as far as the economic reform is concerned, that is basically what this government has foundered on. We are still at the level of theoretical thinking. We realize that this could have fatal consequences for us in that we have been unable to present ourselves to the SNR as a united body; the majority vote, however, was against resolving the situation in this way. Relations today between the deputy prime ministers and many of the ministers, and between the deputy prime ministers and the prime ministers, are bad. End of quote. The prime minister added that there was a lack of unity between the economic ministers in the goverment, and that their views on the economy differed.

The catastrophic economic situation, differing views on the course of economic reform, the negative social repercussions of the reform—above all unemployment, and growing discord, which is making the government unable to operate effectively—are all creating a spawning ground for general political destabilization in Slovak society, and this demands prompt remedial action.

Meciar's Departure From Office Called 'Necessary'

LD2204074891 Prague CTK in English 0527 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Prague April 22 (CTK)—Vladimir Meciar's departure from the post of Slovak premier is evidently necessary, Slovak Deputy Premier Jan Carnogursky said in an interview carried by Monday's Czechoslovak independent daily "LIDOVE NOVINY".

"However, the question is not Meciar yes or no. The point is to establish a functioning government that will enjoy support in the Slovak National Council (parliament)," Carnogursky added.

Asked whether he himself contemplated accepting the post of premier, Carnogursky, who is the chairman of the Slovak government coalition Christian Democratic Movement (KDH), said that upon an analysis of the situation, "KDH agreed it would be better if this post were held by someone else. However, if the situation is such that no other person is acceptable to the other coalition partners, I would take that responsibility."

A decision is likely to be made at Tuesday's session of the Slovak National Council.

Carnogursky Interviewed on Slovak Political Scene

AU1904084891 Bratislava VEREJNOST in Slovak 15 Apr 91 p 15

[Interview with Jan Carnogursky, Slovak first deputy prime minister, by Andrej Javorsky; place and date not given: "A Diagnosis of Slovak Political Intricacies"—first paragraph is VEREJNOST introduction]

[Text] Slovak First Deputy Prime Minister Jan Carnogursky is also the first man in the Christian Democratic Movement [KDH]. The KDH chief is regarded as a sober and rational politician who has almost no popularity among the general public, however. Yet, his views on Slovak political life—with all its intricacies—make us aware of the fact that the KDH is a real political force that is maturing and transforming itself into a phenomenon that we will have to take into serious consideration. The extensive interview on topical subjects, which he granted to our editorial staff, also testifies to this effect.

[Javorsky] What is your view of current KDH activity on the domestic political scene?

[Carnogursky] Critics of the KDH, as well as genial advisers, have reproached us for being indecisive, slow, ambiguous, etc. I believe that the development of the political situation in the CSFR—and in Slovakia in particular—provides a reason for modifying this original evaluation and for admitting that our movement was,

apparently, able to foresee—better than others—the development of the political situation in Slovakia. We have taken the most adequate position and adopted the most realistic political line, and we can do without great words and dramatic gestures. By doing so, our political position is also becoming stronger.

[Javorsky] Irrespective of this, many people resent the fact that you are employing some kind of wait-and-see tactic. It appears, as if you—having drawn a lesson from the first free parliamentary election after more than 40 years—are still waiting for the most appropriate moment to come. Will this happen before the parliamentary election next year?

[Carnogursky] We are not waiting for the parliamentary election. We are simply forming a policy that we believe is necessary for Slovakia and also for the entire state. After all, to have executive powers is not blissful at this time. We are simply putting our program into practice within the framework of the KDH policy statement.

[Javorsky] To what degree are your movement's intentions identical with Slovak intentions, either in the government or in the legislature?

[Carnogursky] To a significant degree, I believe, because other parties and movements are splitting while we are still united.

[Javorsky] Political experts indicate, however, that some disunity, and even a split, is also evident within the KDH itself. Specifically, Protestants—who feel overlooked—are allegedly discontent. Even within the KDH's Catholic majority spectrum there are a number of ideological streams. As recently as last year, one could hear in the lobbies that one KDH wing would transform itself into a conservative party. Could you comment on these speculations?

[Carnogursky] The KDH remains a movement. This means that it still retains its relatively loose internal structure allowing the existence of multiple ideological streams. It is enough if they unite on proposing the candidates and during the election. There is a Protestant section within the KDH. Its existence and attitude correspond approximately to certain differences in cultural preferences of Protestants and Catholics in Slovak society. It is a natural phenomenon. I am, personally, making efforts to retain the integrity of the movement as much as possible and to create conditions within the KDH under which the Protestant section, and also other ideological streams, would feel at home within the movement. The basic consensus that we belong together as Christian Democrats still remains. On the other hand, Protestants still do not have as many opportunities for their self-assertion within the KDH as I would like them to have. At the moment, they form a conservative platform within the KDH. It is quite natural and correct. This conservative platform represents the Protestants' specific situation—but not only the Protestants' situation—and, at the same time, unity within the KDH.

I have the courage to make a prediction that the conservative platform within the KDH will have a much better position and much better relations with the KDH as a whole than the For a Democratic Slovakia [ZDS] platform has with the Public Against Violence movement [VPN] as a whole. In my opinion, this would demonstrate the perfectness and viability of the Christian ideological principles.

[Javorsky] Are you not afraid that a regular conservative party could be established from this Protestant platform and, of course, that this party would have to separate from the KDH?

[Carnogursky] I believe such development is unlikely because a conservative party established in this manner would inevitably be a small party that would not win many votes in elections. On the other hand, within the KDH, a conservative platform could function in a very useful and very necessary manner as a curb on KDH's, perhaps, overly Catholic fundamentalism; at the same time, it could push the KDH toward opening itself up to the broader public. [Javorsky] The KDH is also active on the federal scene within the government coalition and in the Federal Assembly. How do you perceive KDH political activity from the nationwide point of view?

[Carnogursky] The KDH, as well as Slovakia, has been unable to work out an integrated political concept for Slovakia, Czechoslovakia, and Central Europe. Such a concept will be needed sooner or later, however, because informative, integrating, and political processes are already underway on such a scale. I have the feeling that no one in the entire state has the aforementioned concept. It seems that President Vaclav Havel's concept is ideologically the most refined concept; however, I doubt that his concept is realistic. Just because such a concept does not yet exist, political parties and movements in our country, including the KDH, do not appear to have a firm concept; that is, not all their individual steps fit into one unified concept—be it on the level of communities, the republic, the federation, or transnational organizations—yet the KDH is working on such a concept. Furthermore, I also believe that we have gone further in this respect than other parties.

[Javorsky] At the moment, the problem of the constitutional and legal arrangement of Czechoslovakia is apparently the most topical issue. The KDH has come up with its own draft and with its own concept for the constitution. I mean, above all, the issue of the state treaty. Many people—maybe even deliberately, with the goal of harming the KDH—misinterpret your attitude. Could you be more specific about the objective of the treaty you propose?

[Carnogursky] In our opinion, the treaty should guarantee three things. I would like to say that I am using the term state treaty only as a preliminary term. If necessary, we would not insist on this term—some other term could also be used.... First, a treaty is a fundamental legal document confirming the equality and equivalence of the partners and such a treaty would guarantee—also

from the formal point of view—Slovakia's equality in a common state. Second, the treaty would be relatively stable because it would be impossible to make unilateral changes to it and concluding a new wording of the treaty would apparently be complicated—that is, the treaty guarantees stability in relations between the parties to the treaty. Moreover, a treaty cannot be easily changed along with the changes in the political situation. Making a change to relations [between the two parties] would require a legal form, and this is also why we insist that the treaty should have a legal form and not only a political form. Third and last, the treaty should be the basis for our future integration into an integrated Europe as an equal and independent subject in a sense conforming to the Federal Government policy statement.

[Javorsky] The term federation is derived from the Latin word foedus—a treaty. Do you agree that, in fact, a federation can also represent the same thing as the treaty to which you are referring?

[Carnogursky] As a matter of fact, a federation is a treaty, as far as its content is concerned and, for example, the preamble of the Constitutional Law on the Czechoslovak Federation No. 143 of 1968 says it quite clearly. The federation alone, however, would not be enough for us to meet the requirements of a treaty.

[Javorsky] Your opponents maintain that if the concept for a state treaty is to be implemented, Czechoslovakia would have to—admittedly, for a short period, but nevertheless—cease to exist as a joint state. Apparently, two independent states would have to be established that could sign a state treaty when they unite. Is this your interpretation of this contentious point?

[Carnogursky] No. The state treaty would not have to mean such a thing; it will not mean this in our concept for it. In our opinion, the state treaty would be a treaty about a new arrangement for federal relations to date or—in legal terminology—it would be an amendment.

[Javorsky] This means that the draft for a new state treaty—that is, the constitutional draft the KDH has come up with—does not exclude a federative arrangement?

[Carnogursky] Of course not.

[Javorsky] Several draft constitutions are currently being prepared in Slovakia, and a rather confused situation has arisen. Apart from the KDH draft, there is a VPN draft, a Slovak National Party [SNS] draft, a ZDS platform draft will be added to these drafts, there is a draft declaration on Slovakia's state sovereignty, and so on. There is beginning to be chaos in this constitutional and legal concoction. What is your opinion of it?

[Carnogursky] It is as if the saying, "Whoever is a Slovak is the author of the Constitution," applies here. Everyone has the right to produce his own draft—for instance, of the constitution—and if he exercises this right, no one can object.

[Javorsky] The original draft produced by the VPN movement placed more emphasis on a chancellor-type system with a maximum possible increase in the prime minister's authority. What is your view about the position of the prime minister in Slovakia's future constitutional and legal arrangement?

[Carnogursky] I think we should maintain the standard principle of a pluralist democracy and the position of the prime minister should correspond approximately to his current position.

[Javorsky] Including his personal accountability to the Slovak National Council?

[Carnogursky] Certainly. It is fundamentally impossible to exclude the personal accountability of every government member, including the prime minister, to parliament. I cannot imagine any constitutional model that would want to exclude this accountability.

[Javorsky] The current draft constitutions from the VPN and KDH legislative workshops do not differ so much in their main points that they would be contradictory and incompatible. Despite this, your critics refer with anxiety to the fact that the KDH draft is, in fact, a kind of attempt to renew the Constitution of the independent Slovak Republic 50 years ago....

[Carnogursky] The KDH draft constitution also contains a draft treaty. It goes without saying that the constitution itself should contain an entire state structure for the Slovak Republic and the state treaty should, at the same time, define which of the Slovak Republic's rights are delegated by the treaty to the federation. This course of action is in harmony with the current legal situation because—and I repeat—today's introduction to the valid law on the Czechoslovak Federation also enshrines the sovereignty of the national republics, not only of the federation. Their sovereignty is underlined by Article 1 of the aforementioned law. The introduction to the law also enshrines the right of either of the republics to withdraw from the federation. This is the most supreme right of a federation member state and corresponds to international law. The draft constitution drawn up by the KDH proceeds from current valid constitutional criteria; however, at the same time, the KDH is submitting a suggestion that the Slovak Republic renounces some of its authority in favor of the federation.

[Javorsky] In the draft declaration on the Slovak Republic's state sovereignty, there is virtually no mention of the federation until, somewhere at the end, the right to withdraw from a state union is mentioned. What is your evaluation of this draft declaration?

[Carnogursky] I give almost absolute preference to a constitutional solution and to a constitutional course of action. Only a constitutional course of action has a chance of constitutionally and legally improving Slovakia's position and, at the same time, of preventing the international legal isolation that would be an unavoidable consequence of Slovakia's inflexible course of

action. A declaration on Slovakia's sovereignty would, probably, be at variance with the valid constitution; therefore, I do not endorse it.

[Javorsky] Almost a year ago, you clearly confirmed your political stand with respect to the state in an interview (published in SLOVENSKY DENNIK under the headline "Slovakia Within Us and Around Us") despite the repeated intrusive questions aimed at the complete autonomy of Slovakia. You said that at the time you did not intend to leave the state partnership within the framework of the CSFR without sufficient security guaranties. Now, with the perspective of time, what is your opinion on the security guaranties of Slovakia and the CSFR?

[Carnogursky] The qualification that I did not want to leave the CSFR "at the time" was brought in only now, by you.

[Javorsky] You have a good memory. Fine, so without the "at the time."

[Carnogursky] I really have not even considered leaving the CSFR. I do believe, however, that the CSFR is for the Slovaks and Czechs a common ship for a passage to the integrated Europe. Once we land, each of us will have his own boat—just as other nations in the integrated Europe have or will have their own boats. This is my ideal. Of course, history does not follow a straight line but twists and turns. Thus, I would like to point out in my reply to your question that in the future, should we encounter these twists and turns on the way to the common Europe, Slovakia must be much more careful than other European nations and emphasize the security guaranties. I believe that in this respect the situation has not changed at all since last year, perhaps it has got a little worse.

[Javorsky] In other words, your idea of the entry of the CSFR and specifically of Slovakia into the integrated Europe still corresponds to those two stars—i.e. two seats in the European Parliament.

[Carnogursky] Yes.

[Javorsky] Let us return home. The current political scene in Slovakia and in the entire Czechoslovakia is agitated, and tumultuous. When replying to a question in the interview that we referred to earlier regarding further activities of the VPN after the free parliamentary elections, you predicted the split in opinions, and in the movement itself, as a logical consequence of the movement's fulfillment of its historical role. How do you view the situation today, after your predictions came true?

[Carnogursky] Upon leaving the government, I will get into weather forecasting. I believe that I will be as successful as I am in my political predictions.

[Javorsky] Seriously, the VPN still is the leading coalition partner in the Slovak government. What kind of political ways out of the present crisis and of the split in the movement do you see?

[Carnogursky] I want the VPN to survive until the election because we are in a coalition together, and there is no other way of forming a coalition government. If I am to be frank, however, I do not see any future for the VPN because the movement does not have sufficiently strong ideological roots in Slovakia. It is a result of the momentary situation in November 1989, and since the revolutionary situation passed, the movement that sprung to being as an answer to the given situation will have to go too. This is no tragedy, because the VPN has played a useful role in the Slovak political spectrum, and even if it is to perish, no doubt by then it will have contributed to the foundations of the more traditional political parties in Slovakia. These parties will probably be mostly of a liberal orientation.

[Javorsky] The present developments indicate that if not three then at least two parties could come out of the VPN. As you implied, one of them could be a liberal democratic party, do you have any idea what the remaining currents could bear?

[Carnogursky] It should be something in the vein of a social democratic party.

[Javorsky] What is your opinion regarding the VPN Leader Fedor Gal?

[Carnogursky] We meet all the time at the coalition talks. I have great esteem for F. Gal both as a sociologist and as the leader of the VPN. We are on friendly terms, and I only realize the same thing that he has—namely, that we both are too popular.

[Javorsky] In this context it is impossible, of course, to bypass the person of the incumbent prime minister, Vladimir Meciar. It was he, in fact, who set off the mechanism of fragmentation within the VPN. You are his immediate government colleague, his first deputy. How do you view the activity of your boss in the government, of the man under whose leadership the government works? There exist many contradictory opinions on his person....

[Carnogursky] Many people, including journalists, have already noticed that the styles of work of Prime Minister Meciar and myself are different, almost contradictory. The public in Slovakia appreciates the direct way in which he expresses himself and, possibly, also the direct way in which he acts. I understand the public's appreciation of the prime minister's directness, but in a complex political situation there is no such thing as directness of expression and he who cultivates it nonetheless is bound to run up against obstacles very soon. In this case I would not evaluate directness as something a priori positive and the obstacles against which he will run up as something a priori negative. From this viewpoint, it would be very easy to predict that Prime Minister Meciar will run up against obstacles with his political line and will find himself in serious trouble. Even if he manages to extricate himself from his present trouble, which I hope he

does, it will be only a question of time—because he is not likely to change his political style—until he next runs up against obstacles.

[Javorsky] You mentioned that your work methods are not identical with the methods used by the prime minister. Could you specify this in greater detail in the light of pluralism and parliamentary democracy? I am thinking of the objections to the prime minister raised by his opponents, who describe his methods as undemocratic, absolutist, and, in a way, dictatorial.

[Carnogursky] Your question demands, implicitly, that I make an assessment of Prime Minister Meciar, which I do not intend to do. The only thing I can say is that Prime Minister Meciar has a tendency to present partial aspects of a problem as its sole aspects. That is connected with his directness. I, on the other hand, have a tendency to see issues and phenomena in their full complexity.

[Javorsky] When asked whether the KDH supports or does not support the prime minister, you recently declared that the score was 51 to 49 in the prime minister's favor. Has this score changed under the pressure of latest developments?

[Carnogursky] No, it has not changed for the KDH.

[Javorsky] Do you have any suggestion for a politician who would be well-suited to take up Prime Minister Meciar's place, should he resign for whatever reason?

[Carnogursky] I do not because my political forecasts are centered on parties and movements rather than personalities. Besides, Prime Minister Meciar must wage his current struggle for political survival himself, and I do not want to interfere in it.

[Javorsky] In the aforementioned interview, entitled "Slovakia Within Us and Around Us," you also delivered your opinion on the other components of the Slovak political spectrum. Asked about your perception of the activity and the future of Communists (they still called themselves Communists at that time), the present Party of the Democratic Left [SDL], you replied to the effect that they have the right to operate on the political scene of Slovakia and that their place in society will correspond to their activity. Today, however, the formidable fear arises that the Communist Party of Slovakia, renamed SDL, is teaming up with the national and nationally-minded components of political life, with the SNS. The view has been expressed in political circles that Prime Minister Meciar, too, has leftist leanings. What would you say about the activity of the transformed Communists today?

[Carnogursky] I still do not give Communists any great chances. In view of the republic's present economic problems, they can, being an opposition party, very effectively criticize the government but they themselves are unable to offer any solution, not even one that the government is able to provide. There exist signals [confirming what Javorsky said] in that the SDL quite often votes together with the SNS in the Slovak National Council. Were the political line of V. Meciar's ZDS platform to draw any closer—if only politically—to an alliance with the SDL, the original expression of our attitude to Mr. Meciar, the 51 to 49 ratio, would have to change fundamentally in his disfavor.

[Javorsky] Your answers have been, as always, diplomatic, carefully weighed, and almost juridical. Nevertheless, one can feel in your words a hidden fear that the ZDS platform, which does not yet exist legitimately in the legal sense, might drift to the left and form a strong triangle with the SDL and the SNS.

[Carnogursky] If this happened, the KDH would draw conclusions from it that would be negative for all three points of this triangle.

[Javorsky] Do you have specific political steps in mind?

[Carnogursky] Yes.

[Javorsky] As we have touched upon several constituent parts of our political spectrum, could you at least briefly characterize also the third partner in the present Slovak coalition government, the Democratic Party, and other political forces, such as the Green Party or Social Democracy?

[Carnogursky] I am not so bold as to undertake any detailed evaluation. Let me perhaps say a few words about the Democratic Party. Its stance bears out that it is the smallest partner in the coalition and that it has had problems with the loyalty of its deputies. It must therefore logically adapt, to a lesser or greater extent, to the stronger political forces in Slovakia. The other parties [which Javorsky mentioned] are in opposition, and I think that they fit into the total spectrum of multiparty democracy in Slovakia.

Prime Minister Calfa Queried on Economic Reform

LD2004083491 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1750 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Interview with Federal Prime Minister Marian Calfa by unidentified reporter at Prague Castle on 19 April on the "10 Minutes With the Prime Minister" program—live or recorded; questions in Czech, Calfa responds in Slovak]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] Mr. Prime Minister, we are at Prague Castle and the president has just appointed a new federal minister of communications. Can I ask you what you have put on his plate as he takes up his post?

[Calfa] Well, his predecessor was Mr. Petrik who left the post at his own request. I must say that the Ministry of Communications is rather a special department; it handles communications in this state, which is a strategic matter, and so it used to be very strictly controlled, both by the Communist Party and the security services. From this point of view, therefore, there are an awful lot of tasks awaiting the minister, because there is really a certain amount of stagnant water in that department.

Some of the department's tasks have been devolved to the republics, but in general it retains the same structure that we inherited, and I think that it will be necessary to take very energetic action within the department to knock it into some sort of modern shape. It will undoubtedly be necessary to carry out a number of organizational and personnel changes, too. That will be very necessary and that is what the minister has on his plate.

[Reporter] This is a new appointment to the Federal Government, and the Federal Governemnt is up to full strength. We are watching the government crisis in Slovakia and we know that the situation in the Czech government too is not an easy one. The Federal Government gives the impression that it is more consolidated, but let us not shout that too loudly. What is your view of the situation in the Federal Government?

[Calfa] Yes, the Federal Government is up to strength, it is functioning, it is holding sessions, and it is discussing its business. I must say that in the troubled waters of all these political and national conflicts and differing views on all sorts of things, the Federal Government's absolute priority is to pursue the implementation of the economic reform measures, because at the end of the day it is the economy which provides for us all. It directly affects all our people, their jobs, their income, and so on, so this is the main aim we are pursuing, and I think that it is indeed the main aim and the most important thing we should be focusing on.

[Reporter] Nontheless, word has got out that yesterday the government went beyond its agenda, so to speak, to discuss the problems of economic reform. There is also a news report today that the government is going to discuss the course and progress of economic reform, and that Deputy Prime Minster Vales and [Strategic Planning] Minster Hoffmann have been asked to draw up a report. So, what was said in the government yesterday in this context?

[Calfa] Yes, this item was outside the agenda because [Czechoslovak State] Bank President Tosovsky presented a report on the monetary situation with lots of figures about money, credit, and so on, which quite naturally led to a discussion about how the whole process is going. We have presented the Federal Assembly with our report on the state's economic situation; there are differing views there about it, so we reached the conclusion that it would probably be necessary to assess the individual features of the reform—it has already been running for several months—to find out whether it is going as we expected and whether these features tie in with in another. I think this is a natural process. The problem is that the Federal Government has a certain global idea of the economic reform and of how we should be progressing, but it is getting very little feedback because now the whole executive function has in fact been devolved to the republics. On that point I must complain that the Federal Government is really not getting enough information on how the economic reform is being specifically projected in the operations of different enterprises to enable it to adapt, adjust, and fine tune the mesh of its basic macroeconomic levers. [passage omitted]

[Reporter] One last question on the economic reform, and that is about the specific national features. This is something we have been hearing lately from Slovakia in particular, but right from the outset we have been saying that the economic reform is an integrated one applying throughout the country. What is your view on these specific national features?

[Calfa] Well, you know people are getting their terms mixed up a little, because these are not specific features of the economic reform, they are specific features of the economy. The Slovak economy is different from the Czech economy, and the Czech economy is different from the Slovak economy. That is natural because things have developed unevenly; they have not developed proportionately, and what we have done is to draw a georgraphical line, so each side of the former integrated economy is different and has its specific features. Slovakia has its specific features and the Czech lands have theirs. This is not crucial; it is simply a fact, and that is how we should understand it. What is crucial is the remedy we seek for these specific features, because specific features demand specific approaches, specific tools, or else the period over which these tools are applied needs to be adjusted, and so forth. That is the fundamental issue, and that is what we must find a fundamental answer to. If we want the economy to develop as whole, if that is what we are seeking, then we must seek a common remedy and adjust one side to the other. If something is going more quickly in Slovakia, then the Czech economy must be adjusted accordingly; if a thing is going more slowly in Slovakia, then the same applies. In other words, we ought to send out the signals to enable us to seek common solutions; however, if we are looking for specific solutions to specific problems, then we are essentially seeking tools that separate the economies from one another.

So, our purpose as I see it, is to seek these tools and ways of applying them, and to decide whether we want the economy to develop in an integrated way or not. I must add this: If the economy does not develop in an integrated way, then these two states cannot remain together. If we want to the economy to develop in an integrated way, then that is the basis that underpins the idea of the common state of the Czech and Slovak Republics under the umbrella of a federal superstructure. That is the element that serves as a test of the will of the two sides in respect of our future; there are differing views on it, and I must say that these differences between some groups of economists are growing deeper, these differences are spilling over into politics, and they are growing deeper there too, so the divergent or separatist trends are quite strong these days.

Soviet Nuclear Arms 'Had Been Stored' in Country

LD2204075191 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0700 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] [Former Prime Minister] Karoly Gorsz has told NEPSZABADSAG that Soviet nuclear weapons had been stored in Hungary. In answer to a question from the newspaper, the former prime minsiter pointed out that he had received official information from the Hungarian military leadership and the Soviet military leadership in Hungary some weeks after his appointment that nuclear warheads had been stored in a military base in Hungary. Soon after that he traveled to Moscow and personally asked Mikhail Gorbachev to withdraw the warheads from Hungary. The Soviet leader promised this, and about a year later Karoly Grosz was informed that the warheads had been removed from there. Karoly Grosz also said that this presence of the weapons was treated as top secret and he saw Janos Kadar's signature on the document that permitted the weapons to be delivered here.

Croatian President Tudjman Pays Official Visit

Arrives, Opens Talks With Antall

LD1904141191 Budapest MTI in English 1000 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 19 (MTI)—Franjo Tudjman, president of the Republic of Croatia, arrived in Budapest on Friday morning, and immediately began talks with the Hungarian leaders of state.

Tudjman and his party first met Prime Minister Jozsef Antall and the cabinet ministers accompanying him. The Croatian negotiating delegation includes Franjo Gregurich, Croatian deputy prime minister, Vladimir Seks, deputy speaker of the Croatian parliament, Hrvoje Sarinich, head of the President's Office, Rudy Perpich, minister without portfolio, and Minister Gojko Susak (in charge of Croatian minorities).

The Hungarian negotiating delegation includes Minister of Finance Mihaly Kupa, Geza Entz, political secretary of state of the Prime Minister's Office and head of the secretriat in charge of Hungarians living abroad, and Imre Szokai, deputy secretary of state for foreign affairs.

Following the talks with the prime minister, Franjo Tudjman held talks with Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky. In the afternoon, he is to hold a brief meeting with Gyorgy Szabad, speaker of parliament, and will attend a lunch hosted in his honour.

In the afternoon hours, Tudjman is scheduled to meet President Arpad Goncz, at the presidential residence. The president of Croatia is to meet representatives of the Federation of Croatians in Hungary, and will then visit Szolnok, to attend the gala performance of the local Szigliget theatre, held on the occasion of the theatre's re-opening, following the compleiton of renovation work valued at 7 million dollars, carried out by the Croatian firm Ingra.

Bilateral Relations Discussed

LD1904142591 Budapest MTI in English 1237 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Budapest, April 19 (MTI)—Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall and Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, currently visiting Hungary, held a plenary session in the Hungarian Parliament on Friday morning. [passage omitted]

At the warm talks, Antall and Tudjman agreed that though their peoples had been living side by side for eight centuries now, there had been no serious conflict in the course of their history. Under the present circumstances, both sides wish to infuse this good relationship with new qualities, adapting to new conditions and procedures on the path of economic and political restructuring towards western integration.

In the course of the talks, both sides stressed the importance of regional initiatives, emphasizing the fact that a fruitful co-operation was developing between a number of the states of the region in the framework of the Pentagonale.

Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall acknowledged that the 25,000 or so Hungarians in the national minority living in Croatia were guaranteed their rights. In return for this, Hungary guarantees the right of Serbs, Croatians and Slovenians living in Hungary to work in separate organizations instead of in the formerly united organization of southern Slavs.

Viewing the situation of the minorities from an international perspective, Antall recognised that the Council of Europe had been paying due attention to national minorities lately.

As regards inter-state relations and dialogue, the Hungarian Government's partner is the Federal Government of Yugoslavia, Antall stated. At the same time, Hungary is interested in maintaining especially good ties with its immediate neighbours, Croatia and Serbia. This endeavour is marked by the establishment of a Hungarian consulate general in Zagreb.

According to President Tudjman, the setting-up of a Croatian economic-cultural representation in Budapest would serve the development of bilateral ties. Such an institution would function as an organization of interest representation for Croatia.

In the course of the talks, both Antall and Tudjman gave a survey of their countries, home affairs. Antall outlined this year's economic and financial achievements in Hungary.

There was no doubt that the federal system of Yugoslavia was facing a crisis, Tudjman stated. In his opinion,

there were two possible outcomes. One was that a community of sovereign republics would be created. The other version, should some of the republics reject the first, would be the disintegration of the present federation into separate republics. Tudjman refrained from saying which he would prefer.

According to information obtained by MTI's correspondent, Antall and Tudjman have not discussed the controversial issue of Hungary's recent arms deal with Croatia in the present talks.

Cooperation Memorandum Approved

LD2004025791 Budapest MTI in English 1742 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 19 (MTI)—In the wake of the talks between Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall, the sides approved a memorandum on the framework, the directions and the main tasks for a Hungaro-Croatian cooperation. Later on, Tudjman held talks with Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky on the state of bilateral relations and the relevant tasks for the Hungaro-Croatian experts committee. The topics on the agenda included the construction of a motorway, connecting Budapest with Zagreb and the Adriatic Sea, and the joint utilization of the port of Rijeka and the Adriactic oil pipeline. The sides agreed in principle on the opening of new border-crossing points between Hungary and Croatia, and expressed their readiness to co-operate on minority issues. The proposals for co-operation raised during the talks will be elaborated by the expert committees. In the afternoon, Gyorgy Szabad, speaker of Parliament, held a brief consultation with Franjo Tudjman. In a cordial atmosphere, the two politicians established that there were plenty of similarities between the goals and methods of the democratic transformations taking place in both Hungary and Croatia. They shared the view that preserving the peaceful nature of transformation and establishing good-neighbourly relations were a common interest. The consultation was attended by Vladimir Seks, deputy speaker of the Croatian parliament, who signed an agreement with Szabad on the exchange of information on and experience in, economic legislation. In general, they agreed that both Hungagry and Croatia had an interest in strengthening their inter-parliamentary relations. After the consultation, Gyorgy Szabad gave a lunch in honour of Franjo Tudjman, and then the Croatian president met representatives of the Federation of Croatians in Hungary. Later on, the Croatian president paid a brief courtesy visit to the Hungarian head of state Arpad Goncz. Later in the afternoon, Franjo Tudjman and his entourage left for Szolnok to see a gala performance at the Szigligeti Theatre, which has been renovated by the Croatian Ingra firm. Franjo Tudjman is scheduled to leave for home late in the evening.

Arms Deal, Yugoslav Future Discussed

LD2004081491 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Interview with Croatian President Franjo Tudjman by Peter Nyaradi in Budapest; date not given—recorded; Tudjnam in Croatian with superimposed Hungarian translation]

[Excerpt] when talking about Croatia there is hardly anyone who is interested in politics in Hungary who does not immediately remember the arms deal scandal. Peter Nyaradi interviewed the Croatian president about this.

[Nyaradi] Mr. President. Do you regard your talks in Budapest today as successful?

[Tudjman] I believe I held very successful and important discussions. We have been living next to each other for centuries and we have been getting along with each other. Now, after the restoration of democracy, it is particularly justified that we improve our relations in all areas.

[Nyaradi] I did not ask this just by chance, however, because plenty of debate has been going on recently over the role of Croatia in that certain arms deal scandal. Was there mention of this during your talks today?

[Tudjman] No, this was not mentioned, and there was no cause for that, either. Neither the Croatian government nor its Hungarian partner has anything to clarify in connection with this. The Croatian government decided to equip its own police and for this reason it assigned its own foreign trade company to purchase appropriate weapons. We made purchases from sources other than Hungary. Those who want the restoration of the communist regime, or if not that then to extend their own power to the others, tried to use this against Croatian democracy. It is obvious that there were people within Yugoslavia, moreover within Croatia, who wanted to use this against Croatian democracy as well as against Hungary. Although Croatia is part of Yugoslavia, it also has its own independence. This is not as it should be, but this is a longer process. It also includes, let us say, the existence and the equipment of its own police force. Now we have proved that we dare to do this and that we are also capable of this. No matter how desirable it might be in other parts of Yugoslavia, the competent and sued minister will not answer for that.

[Nyaradi] You arrived here from Ohrid, where the presidents of the six republics negotiated for the fourth time on the future of the country. Has the Yugoslav future been shaped yet?

[Tudjman] The fact itself that these presidential discussions take place proves that the fate of the union is in the hands of the republics—that is, ruling does not come from outside or from one center. The meetings up to this time have not brought about specific results, but the important thing is that we talk to one another. Many people would like to hinder the democratic transformation of Yugoslavia. Moreover, they tried to frighten us not only with civil war, but

they wanted to provoke the deployment of the Federal Army indeed by various actions, primarily in Croatia, and against Croatia. Up to now we have prevented this, for we have decided to hold out to the very last, even against the Army if it attempted to overthrow legal Croatian power. Luckily, common sense prevailed at the top of the Army and they announced that they would respect the legally established Croatian system; however, the Army still cannot be considered neutral. By the way, on the basis of our view, the new Yugoslavia can exist only as a union of independent states. This means that every republic will be an independent state. Practically each republic will pursue an independent foreign policy and will possess its own armed force. The model is the EC structure. [passage omitted]

Slovak Prime Minister Meciar Pays Visit

LD2104192391 Budapest MTI in English 1708 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] Budapest, April 21 (MTI)—Vladimir Meciar, prime minister of the Republic of Slovakia, accompanied by a government delegation, arrived in Budapest on Sunday. The delegation is to conduct talks on the issue of the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros hydro-electric dam system on Monday. The delegation was received at the Budapest Airport by Hungarian minister without portolio Ferenc Madl. Also present were Gyorgy Varga, Hungarian ambassador to Prague and Rudolf Chmel, Czechoslovak ambassador to Budapest.

Interviewed Upon Arrival

LD2104214591 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Interview with Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar by Attila Csaszar at the airport in Budapest on 21 April—recorded; Meciar speaks in Slovak with superimposed translation to Hungarian]

[Text] Tomorrow a new Hungarian-Czechoslovak discussion is expected to be held in the matter of Gabcikovo-Nagymaros. More details from the interview by Attila Csaszar:

[Csaszar] At the invitation of Minister Without Portfolio Ferenc Madl the special plane of the Slovak Republic's prime minister and his delegation has arrived in Budapest. In our conversation at the airport I asked the prime minister his opinion about the fact that according to many people, only political decisions can now achieve results as to the future fate of the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros water barrage, and that both sides have prepared a huge number of technical studies.

[Meciar] I feel the political issues are more serious than the technical ones; however, if we manage to find a solution to them, all the rest will be only a question of detail.

[Csaszar] You have denied the news, but nevertheless Hungarian public opinion continues to be acutely preoccupied with the question: Is it true that you have taken steps to divert the Danube in this region?

[Meciar] I have no knowledge to the effect that we have diverted the Danube bed. There is an interstate agreement on this between the two countries, but the construction cannot, in any case, modify the common borders. As far as the Hungarian press is concerned, and that certain C version [alleged Danube diversion plan], what I can say is that work has not started on it.

[Csaszar] If the Bratislava legislature withdraws confidence from you as head of government in connection with the domestic political situation that has evolved in Slovakia, then is the series of discussions that is beginning now, and which is to have several rounds, a wasted effort of yours?

[Meciar] It is not proper to put the question in this way, as the legislature has not yet taken this step. The second half of my reply is, in essence, that Gabcikovo-Nagymaros is the kind of problem between our countries that we must definitely hold discussions about.

[Csaszar] Will the discussions begin once again with the basics, or have you come to Budapest with a concrete package plan?

[Meciar] We have come to Hungary first and foremost for a reply. After all, there exists an intergovernmental agreement. Up unti now it has only been a question of unilateral Hungarian steps, and we have been awaiting your reply, your explanation, as to what next.

Goncz Interviewed on Foreign, Domestic Relations

LD2104174591 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0705 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Interview with President Arpad Goncz by correspondents moderated by Istvan Vizinger in Budapest—live]

[Excerpts] [Vizinger] Greetings listeners, I wish you good morning, and I greet President Arpad Goncz. This is the fifth time, within almost a year, that we have met in the presence of radio listeners. [passage omitted]

Now let us to turn to more important political questions. Tibor Schwartz, from Budapest asks: Do you fear a right-wing or left-wing attempt to seize power?

[Goncz] No.

[Vizinger] Dr. Jozsef Varadi, Budapest: Why has the Soviet-Hungarian relationship deteriorated to such an extent? Should this be improved?

[Goncz] I am not certain that this has deteriorated to such an extent—of course, it is very difficult to assess this. Nonetheless, I would like the Soviet-Hungarian relationship to be not only correct, but warmer as well. The Soviet Union is our immediate neighbor. The Soviet Union now is, practically, moving on the same course as we. There naturally is a difference in size and phase between the two. The Soviet Union, or the Soviet Union's countries, will remain our neighbors, which complement one another economically. There is a lengthy and long-standing historical relationship linking us to the Ukraine. In my view, it is self-evident that the two countries should end up in more than a good relationship, a friendly relationship; we must not forget the existence of the Soviet Union or the region, just as this should not have happened between the two world wars, either.

[Vizinger] Jozsef Varadi also asks whether there is a plan for you to meet Gorbachev.

[Goncz] There is no concrete date, but I would like very much to meet Gorbachev. I met him once, and I consider this meeting to be one of my pleasant memories.

[Vizinger] On whom does it depend that this should come about?

[Goncz] First and foremost, on the diplomatic calendar, on the invitation and the occasion. My impression, however, is that Gorbachev is a rather preoccupied man at the moment.

[Viziner] Dr. Etele Rakoczin asks: The six-party talks will create confusion, rather—this is the listener's opinion. Why is another government necessary—this is also the listener's opinion. What is your opinion of this?

[Goncz] Well, I do not really understand this. The dear questioner has the right to her opinion. I will not engage in predictions on whether or not there will be six-party talks. I very much hope that they will be held, because then it will be more likely that a consensus will be formed—they would sit down to hold talks, to reach consensus. Otherwise it would not be worth it. Regarding another government, I do not know—does she think another government is necessary?

[Vizinger] She means that these six-party talks would constitute the role of another government.

[Goncz] No, these could not constitute that whatsoever. Talks do not constitute political arrangements, and what would be at issue would not be an alteration of political arrangements, but that a national consensus should be created. There will be an attempt, in advance, to discuss the conditions for this. [passage omitted]

[Vizinger] Here is the essence of several questions: What is meant by the often-mentioned conflict between the Ministry of Defense and you?

[Goncz] There were differences, regarding jurisdictional issues, not between the Ministry of Defense and myself, but between the Army's commander and the minister of defense. I, as it is generally known, did not accept the resignation of the Army's commander.

[Vizinger] Why did you not accept it?

[Goncz] Because I was satisfied with his work, and my opinion was that what he did was useful.

[Vizinger] Did this constitute a conflict with the Defense Ministry's leaders, which might worsen and hamper your future relations? This was, in the final analysis, an overture that might have been fitting, in their view, as this obviously is why it happened.

[Gonzc] It is not my task to pass judgement on this. My task is to try to resolve the questions. I very much hope that in the wake of the conflict—put in quotes, and I do not rule out my having a difference of view with any ministry on any issue—a solution will be found, a compromise will be reached, that is useful for both sides, but that first and foremost is useful for the affair which in the present case affects the reorganization, the leadership of the Army.

[Vizinger] [passage omitted] What internal political situation is necessary for you to give a command for the Army to intervene?

[Goncz] There would have to be a state of emergency, and the decisions in this case would be first and foremost political, and not military, decisions. It would have to be a political decision that affects all of the military, the role of the Army.

[Vizinger] Questions regarding the press were also expected. Ilona Bognar writes: Why does the written and electronic press treat the government as an enemy? Others say: Why is the press attacked so much from government circles? The question could perhaps be worded: What do you think, what is the task of the press, television, and radio?

[Goncz] The task of the media is to inform the audience impartially, and by means of facts. Naturally, each person says for himself what is impartial and what is not so, as it is the duty of a newspaper and the media to analyze as well. The free press fulfills its duty if it gives various types of interpretations. I recently saw an example of a newspaper placing side by side several viewpoints that opposed one another. Three of four weeks ago, a Saturday issue of NEPSZABADSAG had a weekly political supplement in which opposing views were placed side by side in an exemplary manner. From this viewpoint, I say that it met perfectly the obligations burdening the free press.

Reagrding the government's attack, the press has the natural instinct to attack the existing authority. The government's natural instinct is not to like that which attacks it, and to like that which verifies or supports its views. I believe that it never will be possible to reconcile the two. Naturally, there are limits to this. I do not think that these might be excessive in Hungary at the moment.

I am not speaking now about the manifestations of certain newspaper articles, of the extreme gutter press; however, I do not sense intolerable animosity on the part of the responsible press and government.

[Vizinger] My experience—and this pertains not only to the media but also to public health, now that you have mentioned impartiality—is that in Hungary, at the moment, as in every basic issue, the real issue regarding impartiality is how much it costs. Do we have enough money to be impartial? [passage omitted]

[Goncz] Let us reconcile ourselves to the direct interrelationship between impartiality and money. There is no doubt about this at a certain level of practice. In Belgium, the Flemish, the Walloon and German minorities, which I believe have minimal numbers, all have universities, community networks, governments—and above all this is a federal government. This is obviously related to the fact that the country is sufficiently rich to create these three types of institutional services, institutional networks. We are far away from this. To be sure, we are far away from this, and it would be of great help if we could do this. Until then, I think that mutual tolerance and sober reason are necessary, first and foremost. Tolerance and sobre reason do not cost money. [passage omitted]

[Vizinger] Two questions have arrived in connection with Romania. Denes Jozef quotes Mr. President. After your entering office you said: Romania's road to Europe leads through Hungary. What do you think of this statement now?

[Goncz] I would probably add that the road of every Eastern European country—ours, too—leads to Europe through the country the minorities of which live within its borders. In other words, it is the duty of every country to guarantee human rights. It is the proof of being European if it guarantees all the human rights to every minority group—either religious, national, or other minority group. At the same time I could say that Hungary's road leads through Romania, as we have a Romanian minority, too. I could also say that it leads through Germany, as we have a German minority. I could say that it leads through Yugoslavia, through Serbia and Croatia to be exact, as we have Croat and Serbian minorities, too. I could say this about other countries, too—Slovakia's leads through Hungary. I do not know how this thing could be misunderstood. It is not interference in national issues; it simply means that in this mosaic of Eastern Europe we will only get into Europe together if we satisfy this basic norm.

[Vizinger] The other question is from Andras Bar, from Budapest. Why are there no regular Romanian-Hungarian high-level meetings? They could probably help the situation that has developed.

[Goncz] They would certainly help, and we would very much like to see such contacts. [passage omitted] In the Romanian-Hungarian aspect such preparatory work, valuable preparatory work in fact, is under way. I very much hope that sooner or later a high-level meeting wil take place, a successful one, because a high-level meeting with no result does more harm than use.

[Vizinger] The average person thinks—and this is behind this question as well—that as human and historical foolishness is so obviously behind some conflicts, then Iliescu and Arpad Goncz should, say, sit down together, have a chat about it, and then that would help. Would such a meeting really help?

[Goncz] I doubt it would help. If Arpad Goncz sits down for a chat with Iliescu at the residence, and they like each other, that is very pleasant, but there will be no detailed agreement from that. It has to be written out and agreed upon in advance.

[Vizinger] Several people ask whether you agree with the fact that the dictatorship of money is stepping into the place of the dictatorship. What can be done to prevent this happening?

[Goncz] I do not believe that the dictatorship of money should step in. One thing is certain, we have to change our former scale of values. I have to admit it hurts. For 40 years we lived in the belief that the entrepreneur who made money was guilty, and stole the money from society. Now we are going to the other extreme: we say that the entrepreneur is the hero of society because he creates jobs. Just because the entrepreneur creates jobs, and by this makes money legally, it does not mean that he is the hero of society. He will become the hero of society if he also takes a lot of other responsibilities from the state or from society, either in supporting culture or in satisfying social requirements.

I can say that the responsible entrepreneur is the hero of the new era. We are at the beginning of an era. The state that was formed over centuries in Western Europe, and in the United States, where society and the wealthy part of society took on a lot of the burden—not only the paying of taxes, but sponsorship, building universities, supporting culture—will certainly be formed more quickly. We have examples of this. The entrepreneurs will have to get used to the fact that these are also among their duties, and we will have to get used to the fact that the entrepreneur is not against society, and is not a thief.

[Vizinger] Klara Bela from Budapest asks whether these six parties are not too few. We feel that large strata, groups, have no real interest representation in the National Assembly or outside it.

[Goncz] As the election showed, the six parties were not too few, because the others did not receive enough votes to get in. A lot of people think that the six parties are too many because, as the problems of the coalition show, it is quite difficult to govern with a coalition rather than with the parliamentary majority of one party. The question of interest representation is different. The interest representation of the employees, or the employers, is not necessarily gathered around political lines. The question of social interest representation is such that it serves the

basic building of politics, but it is not politics itself. So we will have to create a structure of interest coordination and interest representation. [passage omitted]

[Vizinger] The last question is from Dr. Ibolya Geroe from Bekescsaba. The country is impatient, asks questions, but does not always receive an answer. How does one have to talk to a country?

[Goncz] Honestly. Honestly and clearly.

[Vizinger] I thank you very much for this honest talk today. You have heard the president of the Republic, Arpad Goncz answered your questions today on radio. Thank you for the questions; thank you for the answers. I think we will meet in the near future, as it is now a custom. Goodbye.

Future of Government Coalition Questioned

LD1704192191 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1600 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Interview with Laszlo Koever, Federation of Young Democrats member, and Laszlo Salamon, member of the Hungarian Democratic Forum faction's chairman's panel, by Janos Hollos; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] Laszlo Koever, one of the prominent Federation of Young Democrats [FIDESZ] deputies, attributes the fact that FIDESZ is being linked with the Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF]—not for the first time either—to the hidden political tactics of the MDF and the Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ]. In addition, this always happens at a time when there is a danger of the coalition disintegrating. A summary from Janos Hollos follows.

[Hollos] Because of the long drawn-out debate over the compensation bill, many are certain that already this month the first government coalition of the new Hungarian National Assembly will fall apart. Naturally, the guessing started at once about a possible new combination. Two variations are most stubbornly in the foreground.

One is that the MDF will form a minority government; the other is that an MDF-FIDESZ coalition will be formed. This, knowing what took place earlier, would count as a sensation.

Today's NEPSZAVA, referring to sources close to the government, already published the information that, in practice, the FIDESZ faction is ready for government. There are only four among them who still resist. One of them is Laszlo Koever.

[Koever] I have to declare that I regard this as a slur on my honor. I would even categorically deny that there is such a clique of four within the FIDESZ faction. It is my opinion that here some are projecting their wishful thinking into the real situation. The suggestion that the majority of the FIDESZ faction would welcome entering the government coalition with enthusiasm, this too is nothing more than silliness [badarsag].

[Hollos] If I understand you right, you do not suspect malice behind this statement, only wishful thinking?

[Koever] Yes. I was being polite. Let us call things by their name. I am not supposing malice, but tricky political intentions, from both sides—both the MDF and the SZDSZ. It is in their interests to raise suspicions about FIDESZ on the pretext of flirting with the government because I think our actual, real political influence is not comparable to the size of our mandate, and in this sense it is—I am suggesting—uncomfortable.

[Hollos] In the press the MDF has already refuted several times that they are having discussions with FIDESZ about the coalition. Dr. Laszlo Salamon is a member of the MDF faction's chairman's panel.

[Salamon] So far in the faction the alternative that the FIDESZ could be included in the coalition has not yet been raised.

[Hollos] What is your personal view? Would the majority of the MDF faction have sympathy with such an idea?

[Salamon] I would not dare to predict, but I can say one thing. The personal relations with the FIDESZ MP's are generally not bad—indeed. In my opinion, from the three opposition parties, FIDESZ is the most constructive. I do hope the present coalition will remain, but if by any chance this did not after all remain, then in the interest of the stability of the country every realistic possibility must be examined. This is unquestionable. This is my personal view of it.

[Hollos] Finally, what can be regarded as probable is that until the issue of the compensation bill is settled there will continue to be a season of various speculations.

SZDSZ on Suggested Party Approach, Governing

AU1704124291 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 13 Apr 91 p 7

[Interview with Imre Mecs, executive member of the Alliance of Free Democrats, by Dezso Pinter; place and date not given: "Coalition and Opposition on the Tip of an Iceberg"—first paragraph is MAGYAR HIRLAP introduction]

[Excerpts] Imre Mecs recently told MAGYAR HIRLAP that, faced with a purely bourgeois radical or bourgeois liberal movement, the Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ] should develop into a movement with a broad basis, with great social sensitivity, and with an adherence to national interests, a movement that guarantees freedom of conscience in the wider sense. The SZDSZ executive believes that sentimental politics are passe, and that the Federation of Young Democrats [FIDESZ] cannot be considered as a natural ally: "They have their

own tactical and strategical goals, which often do not coincide with ours, so they have become our rivals." [passage omitted]

[Pinter] It is relatively easy to outline the various—slightly different—tendencies that exist within other parties, but in the case of the SZDSZ, it is difficult to make such a distinction. Are views really that harmonious within the SZDSZ?

[Mecs] A paradoxical situation has developed: Our membership and our leadership really are united, and that is how the image comes across, but there are more and more of us who feel that it would be preferable if platforms and groups developed—reflecting current trends—and if opinions were clearly formulated after initial clashes. It cannot be that 30,000 or 40,000 politicizing people think in exactly the same way. At the moment, divisions are horizontal rather than perpendicular. The executive body—primarily composed of former democratic opposition members—is separate from the national council, which in turn is separate from the membership; there is no adequate transition, the division is not vertical enough. Until now, we saw this as an advantage, but I think that in the future, we will have to make sure that different opinions are expressed in an appropriate way. [passage omitted]

I think that on the basis of our declaration of principles, practically every Hungarian citizen could accept our movement. At the same time, visible narrowing tendencies within our party inevitably go hand in hand with a decrease in tolerance; most of all, these tendencies threaten to push away the masses who like to maintain traditions. We are prepared to take on the responsibility of government, so we cannot proceed in this way. Unfortunately, our political opponents slander our name, they accuse us of being unpatriotic cosmopolitans and anticlericalists, and they claim that we force national values into the background. [passage omitted]

[Pinter] A lot of things have happened in this country since the election, and all parliamentary parties are responsible—probably to a varying degree—for the prevailing political disenchantment in society. Do you accept that statement? If so, how would you describe the SZDSZ's responsibility?

[Mecs] It would be easy to declare that we are not responsible for anything and that we have behaved impeccably, but that is not the case. Following the creation of the National Assembly, from the point of view of parliamentarism and government functioning, we signed an extremely important pact with the Hungarian Democratic Forum, but this pact made our role seem uncertain. During an initial period, we did not know how to criticize the government appropriately, and we also lost some of our rights, to a certain extent. We were unable to explain all this to our members, and through our members, we lost some of our communication with society. The time has come for us to state quite clearly that we were unable to develop adequate characteristics, that we were very hard, radical, and aggressive in some cases, and unnecessarily loyal to the government in others. These two behaviors got mixed up. [passage omitted]

[Pinter] Do you think that the SZDSZ could form a government on its own, if circumstances allowed?

[Mecs] Yes, it could form a government on its own, but I would rather tend to think that in a specific social situation, the SZDSZ would examine who its possible coalition partners could be. [passage omitted]

[Pinter] Do you think that Hungary's political stability might be in danger?

[Mecs] Yes, definitely, because parliamentarism has been forced to withdraw onto an island within society. Alternatively, let me put it this way: The government coalition and the opposition live together on the tip of an iceberg. Society is unstructured. The creation of appropriate interest representation organizations, trade unions, and chambers would be very important, and, in general, there should be more self-governing in society. [passage omitted]

Walesa Queried on Country's Political Development

AU1904072591 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 16 Apr 91 pp 1, 3

[Interview with President Lech Walesa by Tomasz Wolek and Kazimierz Woycicki; place and date not given: "No Monopoly Should Be Allowed To Appear"]

[Text] [ZYCIE WARSZAWY] You have talked about the need to create "a left and right leg"—that is, the necessity of attaining a political balance in Poland. Does the Polish political system already really have a sufficient amout of strong support from those two legs? Does it possess the appropriate stability?

[Walesa] No. Today there are 80 legs, and that is, unfortunately in a sense, the rule. It is also the legacy of communism, when we, who have been disappointed, betrayed, and cheated, go to the opposite extreme and look for a great many solutions at once. Perhaps this is the reason for the excessive number of political initiatives; however, it is the only path, the path of trials and inevitable mistakes to create something resembling a European solution in the future. Of course, in addition to that there is a left wing, a right wing, and various shades of "center."

I think that after the experience of communism, almost nothing should be imposed. We should proceed boldly, while, of course, taking care that we do not descend into anarchy. On the other hand, there are negative, even bad solutions that should be permitted. Society should consider concepts carefully and then make a choice.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Do we already have the right and the left that you are thinking of?

[Walesa] No. There is a long way to go to full maturity. A genuine political spectrum will emerge in a few years. It is a difficult process, but a start has, nevertheless, been made.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Today, market reforms arouse a lot of skepticism, although there was widespread acceptance of them initially. In your opinion, how can one convince people in a way that would secure enduring public support for the idea of a market economy?

[Walesa] When we impose something on people, that is the result that we get. Everything has to be brought out into the open. At the same time, of course, we have to demonstrate, interpret, and argue. Then life itself will choose the necessary solution. After all, there are no ready recipes. There are things that we say no to today and will say yes to tomorrow, and vice versa. The deciding factor will be whether a solution is effective and practical. That is the only way to convince those who have doubts. One thing is certain. We are heading toward Western Europe, the Western world, and those are the laws that are in force there and Poland cannot be any different. The fact that we are setting off too late, however, that we have lost a couple of generations, that we have to catch up 50 years in every field after communism is the result of our unfortunate historical legacy.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Workers, especially those employed at large plants, were the main driving force behind "Solidarity." Currently, they are perhaps bearing the brunt of the market reforms, are being affected by unemployment, are troubled by a feeling of uncertainty about the future. Mr. President, do you think that a large number of those people who built up "Solidarity" together with you are among those who are the most disappointed and lost?

[Walesa] Of course, I myself used to say that "Solidarity" is a reform movement, that it is primarily a union, that that is the way it has to be, because otherwise they will finish us off. That was something that a lot of people did not like at the time; they used to shout me down, but they were then the first to leave the movement and they went off in a different direction, maintaining that the movement could not be a trade union movement, because a union operates according to certain rules, it is destined to press for higher wages, and this cannot be reconciled with purely political tasks.

Then there is the whole problem of the workers stratum, which was created on a scale exceeding the real needs of the economy. It was meant to accord artificial legitimacy to the system. The criteria for setting up large plants and factories, which are now mostly outdated, were not economic, but political. As a result, most plants are uneconomic. They are not modern or competitive. It is something that we have to go through. We have to implement reforms and that involves costs, including social costs.

I think that the theoretical experts are probably missing the point. What I hear is something rather different when I listen to what workers are saying. It sounds rather more like: "President, you do not know how to govern, because you are throwing me out of a job; I am standing next to a lathe, and yet there is so much work to be done that the machine has a job. In any case, it does not have to stand idle, and I would have something worth doing, but you just do not know how to find something for me to do." Those are the complaints that you hear in the shipyards and everywhere else, that machines are standing idle, that we are not using the assets that we have and that we are not building apartments. Those are the typical doubts that are being expressed, and they are not to be disregarded. That is how the workers think; perhaps they do not say so outright, but that is their logic. When they want to protect the existence of large factory departments, it is because that is where those machines are, they see that great potential, and the country's great and unfulfilled needs. These are not simply demands. It is a manifestation, often an awkward manifestation, of employees' genuine civic concern. It represents a great stock of will, which should be used for the good of our economy and for the good of Poland.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] During the course of the election campaign, however, which obviously relied on certain intellectual shortcuts, did you not to a certain extent use catch phrases and express rather too superficial views? Did, for example, suggestions that there was enough work for everyone, that there was no question of unemployment in Poland not arouse false hopes, false ideas about the real situation?

[Walesa] I fought for establishing the necessary legal conditions for the operation of banks as soon as I arrived in office, under different conditions, when I had no government, when I had no prime minister. I could not force a faster pace in the way I could at rallies, because I had no one who could carry that out. There would have been anarchy.

Next, I think that everything that I said at the time can be realized. A lot of new jobs will be created in the construction sector alone, which was haphazardly organized. What about the enormous services sector? Or the various forms of food processing? All of this has to be organized on a modern footing, however, and be based on functional principles of management and labor organization.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] What danger is posed by voters who are dissatisfied with the reforms to date and ready to vote for candidates who have "dropped in out of the blue?" Will the opponents of economic reform and the current direction of change not obtain a majority in the new Parliament?

[Walesa] There is no doubt that there is a danger that should be taken seriously. I am convinced, however, that the majority will favor the path of reform that we have already embarked on. Demagogy only works in the short term.

That is why I am not afraid of someone like Tyminski in the longer term. He can only be a passing danger, because if he were to come to power in Poland, he would give himself away and a month later he would disappear. He is not in a position to deliver anything whatsoever. That is because no one can deliver anything in the present state of affairs. The most that can be done is to aid the process for achieving something, to create real opportunities. We have to remove various absurdities more quickly. We do not know how to galvanize the potential to create opportunities. We know how to lay people off, because that is simplest, but we do not know how to use the assets that are in the bank. This has been neglected since last year.

In general, funds really should not have been allocated to outdated plants, ports, shipyards, or steelworks. The private person, however, the person who has a trade and wants to open a business, could have been given funds, and he would have done well for himself and, indirectly, for the country.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Do you not think that there is a real danger of a resurgence of communism against this background, especially in light of the open struggle for power that is now under way in the Soviet Union?

[Walesa] I do not fear the return of communism, because that is impossible. What I am worried about, however, is the time that is being lost and the price that we might have to pay for drawing out this transition period.

There is one further rather obvious thing that often escapes notice—namely, people can be divided up into those who are active and those who are inactive. Active people are even capable of changing their color from red to blue, because they are energetic, vital, because they have to pursue business, live by their wits, engage in politics. Then, there are others who complain, will always complain, and will never do anything.

So, should we be looking for those who are inactive, who complain, who often go off for a beer, and could not care less about anything? Or should we try to create opportunities, even for those who do not cause favorable associations to spring to mind, and not put people in jail. This does not mean that I am lenient toward criminals and wheeler-dealers. There can be no doubt about that. That is what the law is there for.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] How does the present pace of change compare to the "acceleration" that was being advocated so intensely not so long ago?

[Walesa] It was not possible to accelerate change when there was no prime minister and no government and when the prime minister and the government had to be given an opportunity to acquaint themselves with all the issues. I could not advance acceleration further without tripping them up. So, I am still not able to implement the acceleration that I announced during the presidential campaign, but that was the normal thing to do. The present government has to be given a minimum amount of time to carry out some positive work. It has barely started working and has surely already produced results that are not at all bad.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] What role do you see for yourself in the upcoming election? How do you intend to influence their course and, therefore, their result?

[Walesa] I will not allow any group to go under. I will not allow any group to be excluded, and I will not allow any group to achieve too much. That is the role I have given myself, and I will see to it that no monopoly predominates.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Does this mean that you have abandoned the idea, which you were considering at one time, of forming or backing a presidential party?

[Walesa] No, I have never planned that, except in the event that everything should really begin to fall apart and the communists should start to gain an upper hand. In those circumstances I would take everything possible under my wing to stop communism.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Your efforts to encourage Western companies to invest in Poland are becoming increasingly successful. Many Poles, many workers are afraid of Western capital, however, and there is very grave resistance. Warnings are being given about selling off Poland and so on. How, in your opinion, should this kind of resistance be countered?

[Walesa] In a word, why do people go to work in America for a time? Because of what they can earn there. Why should they go if they can earn as much here? After all, we are going to have the same kind of standards, the same kind of insurance, and the same kind of legislation. So, people will be no worse off here. The situation today is that we are not giving people a chance to make money and we are not making enough ourselves. What I am suggesting is that that is too bad and we should allow others (those from the West) to make some money, but we too will make some money in our own country.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Since the election campaign, to what extent have your views changed on the role of the president and the scope of the opportunities and responsibility linked to the office?

[Walesa] In these times, the president must be flexible and must always be ready to deal with a difficult and changing situation. We cannot be pigheaded about anything, and that is why I am going to act flexibly. Somebody might say that you can just get together some clever people and always find the best possible answers. That is impossible in the situation in which Poland finds itself. One has to act as a catalyst, provide a stimulus. I might get my wrists slapped when I do that, but that is not the point. I have a job to do.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] We are running up successes at the moment, particularly in the foreign policy field. On the economic front, progress is still slow. In your opinion, will the public take note of these foreign policy successes and will they put them to good use? Will they affect the way in which partners are chosen?

[Walesa] I would say no, because that is not the point in this context. I want to explain to the West that the reforms may collapse. We have given them the victory that generations have fought for. The only question is whether Europe will now know how to manage all of this. So, I give encouragement. What I say is that we have a chance to develop correctly. If we do not take that chance, then chaos will begin to set in. A solution can only be achieved through links with other countries. That is why Europe has reached a decisive point—it is either a great start for all of us or defeat. Everything has to be transformed, and no one can achieve that by going it alone.

I am seeking to show Europe that Poland has gone the farthest as far as reforms are concerned. It will provide an example to others, who will find that although things are a little tougher, they will also be a little easier, because a way has been cleared for emerging from communism.

Sejm Commission Establishes Draft Election Rules

LD1904100291 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 17 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

[Jan Forowicz report: "Draft Election Rules Completed"]

[Excerpts] At its meeting on Tuesday, 16 April, the Sejm *Constitutional Commission completed its work on a* final draft of the election rules for the Sejm elections, nine days ahead of schedule. [passage omitted]

The Commission completed its review of 17 chapters of these rules, consisting of several hundred articles. It approved a rule whereby a voter, when choosing from a specific list of candidates, indicates not only the party he is voting for, but also, by means of an X on the ballot paper, his preferred candidate for that party's mandate. The most important result of this is that the road to the Sejm may be blocked for anyone who is unpopular in his local community but who nevertheless appears on his party's list. Deputy Marek Dziubek of the Citizens Parliamentary Club complained that this would make the election too personal, thus harming the interests of political parties. [passage omitted]

Deputy Ryszrad Bugaj of Labor Solidarity demanded that an upper limit on election campaign spending by individual election committees be established. It was agreed that this might prevent an eventual "purchasing of parliamentary seats." This solution is useful in a situation where nascent political parties are poor and thus cannot compete with the rich parties in the struggle for votes. The deputies established a limit of 10 times the average monthly salary in basic sectors of the economy as far as single-seat constituencies are concerned, and a limit of 60 times this salary as far as multiple-seat constituencies are concerned.

Finally, the Commission voted to place the entire draft election rules before the Sejm, with 21 deputies voting for, and two against.

Bielecki Meets With Sejm Agriculture Commission

LD1904215591 Warsaw TVP Television Network in Polish 1730 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] The prime minister is sticking to his line and the peasants to theirs. That, in short, was the nature of the meeting today between [Prime Minister] Jan Krzysztof Bielecki and the Sejm Agriculture Commission. The deputies are demanding, among other things, an increase of 100 percent in the customs duty rates proposed by the government, the inclusion of vegetables in those things subject to duty, as well as fruits other than exotic ones and conserves, and the introduction of duty on seed wheat. The prime minister states that such a great increase of duties is unrealistic, for one must also keep consumers in mind. Poland has an excess in food exports for the first quarter of 642 billion zlotys, and apart from that customs policy is a significant element in negotiations with EEC states on the subject of an association treaty—but this was already discussed behind closed doors.

PSL Deputy Withdraws No Confidence Motion

LD1904215991 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 2100 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Following talks between Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki and the Sejm Commission for Agriculture and Food Economy, which took place during a break in the Sejm debates, Deputy Zdzisław Domański of the Polish Peasants' Party [PSL] withdrew his motion of a vote of no confidence in the government.

It was decided that there would be a further meeting with the prime minister in two weeks, and in the meantime the commissions would prepare concrete proposals for protecting the agricultural market from dishonest competition, which is how the deputies see the import of highly subsidized foodstuffs from the West.

The prime minister informed the commission about the conditions that the government took—and has to take—into consideration when deciding the level of customs duties on agricultural products and foodstuffs.

During that part, which was closed to the press, Jan Krzysztof Bielecki also reported to the commission on the negotiations regarding the association of Poland with the EEC.

Experts Find No Chemical Weapons in Soviet Units

LD1904193391 Warsaw PAP in English 1638 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Warsaw, April 19—Polish experts found no chemical weapons or means or equipment for their use during an inspection carried out on April 17 and 18 in two Soviet Army units stationed in this country, a press spokesman of the Ministry of National Defence (MON) reported today. During the inspection, the Polish team controlled depots of artillery ammunition and chemical equipment chosen by the Polish side.

Journalists were told at a press conference today that the principal aim of the inspection was to confirm previous declarations of the Soviet side that chemical weapons had not been stored in Poland and checking in practice the verification procedures of the convention on chemical weapons ban negotiated by 39 states at the disarmament conference in Geneva.

The objects were selected for inspection by the Polish side, and the command of the Soviet Army in Poland was only notified a dozen or so hours before the Polish inspectors turned up.

So far [as received] Polish experts and officers have had no access to this type of Soviet objects. The inspection was very thorough, director of the department for the U.N. system in the Polish Foreign Ministry Jan Woroniecki stressed. The Foreign Ministry representative said the inspection was credible and he ruled out any scenery making.

The fact that the inspection was carried out and its results should be seen in the context of confidence reconstruction in the Polish-Soviet relations, Woroniecki said. He recalled that the inspection had been planned for last February but then commander of the Soviet Army in Poland General Viktor Dubynin refused to agree.

The inspection results will be presented to the disarmament conference in Geneva in a form of a joint Polish-Soviet communique.

French President Mitterrand Continues Visit

Holds News Conference With Iliescu

AU1904153791 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1008 GMT 19 Apr 91

[News conference by President Ion Iliescu and French President Francois Mitterrand with unidentified foreign and domestic reporters in Bucharest on 18 April—live; Iliescu speaks in Romanian, with simultaneous translation into French; Mitterrand speaks in French, with superimposed translation into Romanian; translated from the Romanian]

[Excerpts] [passage indistinct] [Reporter, in Romanian with superimposed translation into French] President Mitterrand, in Parliament you said that to think means to say no, as a rule; but that the time has come to say yes. Is this a reproach for the opposition in our country and, in this respect, an appeal to it to cooperate with those in power? How did the opposition present to you the situation in Romania? I am referring to last night's meeting. Thank you.

[Mitterrand] My dear, I do not concern myself with Romania's domestic problems. They do not fall within my sphere of competence. What I am interested in is to see whether Romania has truly embarked upon the road to democracy. Because I believe this is the reality, I have come here. If I had thought that this were not the case, I would not have come here. This way of thinking is the path followed by the country's leaders. There is, there has been, no reason for France to have been absent here in Romania, particularly after the revolution. I have no advice to dispense. I listen to what I am told. It is no special thing to receive the Romanian opposition representatives. In all the countries I visit, I always receive the opponents of the regimes in the respective countries. I do the same in countries where democracy is considered to be older. In Britain, for instance, I meet with the representatives of the Labour Party; in Germany, I meet with the German Social Democrats; I meet with the chairman of the Spanish Conservative Party, and so forth. [passage omitted, including indistinct passage]

[Reporter, in French with simultaneous translation into Romanian] A question for Mr. Ion Iliescu. Mr. President, many Romanians, concerned with the fact that democracy is (?not) reaching all press services, would like to see more of it on a local basis.

[Iliescu] This is a goal of our future activity. We plan to organize local elections by the end of the year. This, however, is linked to the drafting of a law on local administrative reorganization, which will be submitted to Parliament in the coming months. On this basis, local elections will be held. [passage omitted]

[Reporter (?Dumiere)] My name is (Dumiere). I am an ANSA [Italian press agency] reporter and president of the Association of Foreign Press in Romania. I have a question for President Mitterrand. Mr. President, Romania's policy on national minorities was the subject of criticism in France and other countries in Europe. After your visit to Bucharest and the information received from President Iliescu and his aides, what is your opinion on this subject?

[Mitterrand] The problem of minorities is not a purely Romanian one, but, with very few exceptions, it is typical of all European countries, or African countries. [Words indistinct] This does not primarily refer to minorities' rights, but rather to ensuring the cultural entity of minorities wherever they exist. Hence, it is not a purely Romanian problem, but a problem also experienced by Romania. Everybody is aware of the minorities living in Romania—there are some very important ones, the Hungarian one or the German one; but, there are other minorities, as well. The problem is to ascertain what these minorities want. In this respect, many opposition members said that, regardless of what we are, we want to remain Romanian, while preserving our cultural identity. We saw what happened to the Kurds. That is why it is very important to define a general statute on observation of the rights of all minorities; however, this does not mean that we are in favor of splitting or causing the disintegration of existing states. That would be a completely arbitrary and illusory thing. [passage omitted including indistinct passages]

[Reporter in Romanian, with superimposed translation into Romanian] Mr. President, welcome from Great Paris to Little Paris. I would like to tell you that you are very well known in Romania. Not as of yesterday or the day before, when your book appeared in our bookstores; but much longer—more exactly, over a year ago when, in January, you made a certain statement in Budapest, something like: Two-thirds of Hungary's territory is now incorporated in other states. Allow me to tell you that this is an inexactitude, from a historical viewpoint—you should have said that two-thirds of the former Austrian-Hungarian Empire now belongs to other states and so forth. [passage omitted] After 22 December 1989, certain rather foreseeable things happened in our country; among other things, I would like to tell you, that the Vatra Romancasca Union was set up here. This is more a state of mind, rather than anything else. [passage omitted] Mr. President, regarding your Budapest statement, I would like to ask you, on what basis did you make it? [words indistinct]

[Mitterrand] I regret that I cannot answer each of the points included in this very long and [word indistinct] question. I believe the answer to it was included in my previous reply. Let us recall it. All or almost all countries in Europe are faced with the problems of minorities; therefore, one should define a code of rights for these minorities—a subject I have been concerned with for years on end, and which I took up a few moments ago as well as during my trip to Hungary. If both of you would like to [word indistinct] and recuperate all the minority groups propelled by historical events to all corners of this continent, you will never find your way out of this no-exit situation. As a matter of fact, my impression is

that you (?refute), which is actually understandable. Hungary's hopes of recovering its lost territories—because I believe that Hungary belonged to the Austro-Hungarian, if my (?memory of) history does not desert me; so, you (?refuse) to allow Hungary to consider as its own territories that today are Romanian territories. Well, one can raise another question: Does Romania consider certain territories that today belong to other states as its own? I do not want to enumerate them, so as not to provoke other incidents [words indistinct]. If you turn to the north, to other countries, to the West, for example, well, what would the Germans do? After all, German lands have become Polish in the meantime. What will the Poles do, who have territories belonging to the Soviet Union. This is the history of Europe of late, which was not at all [words indistinct]. There are many minorities today. Maybe they would like to regain their own cultures. I did not hear anyone here, in Romania—maybe there are a few who are thinking it—anyway, no one from the minorities told me that they would like to leave Romania. They all told me that they want to stay citizens of Romania, which should however protect their (?specific) identity. Therefore, this is a question of finding intelligent ways of approaching problems. Of course, this does not prevent [words indistinct] and to want to reintegrate the lands that belonged to your forefathers for generations on end. Of course, you Romanians, have the right to regret that history has made you lose, over the centuries, territories and populations over which you had [word indistinct]; you, Romanians, have the right to think that these other territories, which you consider inhabited by a Romanian population—because, as I said, well, if I were to tell you, go and recuperate your territories, you will not be against it [sentence as heard]. Of course, to say such a thing, would be as imprudent as in Budapest. I was referring to the right of minorities, not to breaking up states. I am not for the dismemberment or the maiming of states, provided that they behave in a democratic way, without resorting to terror and persecution to stifle minority culture, which is something to be condemned. This is not the case here, however. To conclude this matter, I hope that the Romanian constitution will deal with this series of problems appropriately. As for my statement in Budapest, you can choose, as it pleases you, between it being a blunder, a desire to please my hosts, or my lack of knowledge. I am not a referee between Hungary and Romania, however; even if I were asked to do it, I would refuse [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Dear listeners, this news conference was very heartfelt and open dialogue between the two presidents and the Romanian and foreign journalists. In conclusion, let me recall from memory the following conclusion drawn by French President Francois Mitterrand: Democracy is a reality in Romania, that is why I came here.

Iliescu Views Visit

AU1904133391 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1008 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Statement by President Ion Iliescu on occasion of visit by French President Francois Mitterrand; place not given—live]

[Excerpts] First and foremost, I would like to express satisfaction at being able to meet today with you to clarify—through this short introduction—certain points in connection with the progress of the visit Mr. Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic, is paying to our country.

As I said in last night's toast, we greatly appreciate and attach great importance to this visit by the head of the French state to Romania, and we view it as a political event that marks the upward trend of relations between our countries in the context of the profound changes that are taking place in our country and on the European continent.

This visit also has a great emotional and sentimental connotation when bearing in mind the rich traditions of friendship and solidarity between our countries and peoples, which, under the new conditions, are further expanding and diversifying.

During the talks that I conducted with President Francois Mitterrand, we examined the current stage and especially the prospects of our bilateral relations in all areas. We also had a broad exchange of views on the major problems of the current international situation.

I would like to make special mention of the cordial spirit of understanding and mutual respect that characterized our talks and the friendly and open atmosphere in which our program took place. I also want to emphasize our mutual desire to lend new scope to the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between Romania and France in the spirit of the Paris Charter, the CSCE, and in the spirit of promoting a climate of peace and cooperation in Europe and throughout the world.

We have agreed to begin negotiations soon to conclude a treaty of understanding, cooperation, and friendship between Romania and the French Republic. The foreign ministers of our countries, Messrs. Roland Dumas and Adrian Nastase, have exchanged letters in this respect. This important document is to solemnly sanction our common desire to strengthen both traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between Romania and France and their pledge to work within European bodies to achieve, in the near future, the common desire to build a Europe of cooperation, peace, and security.

The minister and the high dignitaries, who are accompanying President Mitterrand, have conducted talks with their Romanian counterparts. On this occasion they examined tangible opportunities to increase and diversify economic and cultural-scientific exchanges between our countries and agreed on measures aimed at capitalizing on the potential offered by the new conditions in Romania.

On the same occasion, two more documents were signed: one regarding the establishment of a Romanian-French Management Institute and the second regarding cooperation in (?mining). I take pleasure in emphasizing that

the exchange of views that took place with both President Mitterrand and between the two foreign ministers revealed the similarity of our countries' positions on and approach to European issues as well as to the ways of settling conflicts in the world. In this context, the Romanian side expressed interest in the initiative by the president of France regarding promoting the idea of a European confederation.

Before concluding, I would like to emphasize that the Romanian- French summit dialogue will mark an important moment for holding the fourth conference of the Francophone countries that is to take place in Paris in November this year and to which Romania has been invited. Then we will be able to continue the dialogue we have begun.

Thank you for your attention.

Mitterrand on Aims of Visit

AU1904135891 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1013 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Statement by French President Francois Mitterrand at news conference in Bucharest—live; in French with superimposed translation into Romanian]

[Summary From Poor Reception] "Ladies and Gentlemen," "this is a short visit." During it, "we concentrated on the spheres in which we were able to cooperate and conduct a dialogue. We have tackled the major problems that influence, on the one hand, relations between Romania and France and, on the other, Romania and Europe."

"I am pleased with the conditions that have been provided for us by President Iliescu and Prime Minister Roman" and "especially by the presidents of the Parliament chambers. Up until tonight, I will listen, in accordance with my possibilities," and "I will leave the country with a desire to come back. A political experiment is taking place here." "Besides the laws that have to be issued, the economy has to be restructured," and we can "only wish you success in your work and in the efforts of all those who are contributing to this reconstruction. I have come here to listen to France's friends. It has to be emphasized that ours has been a long-term friendship," and today's "hospitality is proof of this."

Ladies and gentlemen, I am now at your disposal.

Speaks in Bucharest About Minorities

LD1904145791 Paris International Service in French 1200 GMT 19 Apr 91

[(Laurent Coulon) report on news conference by French President Francois Mitterrand with unidentified foreign and domestic reporters in Bucharest; date not given]

[Text] President Francois Mitterrand's news conference has just ended: The head of state was eager to explain his visit to Romania once again. In reply to questions put to him on this matter, Francois Mitterrand ended by saying that he came today at a time when Romania had found its way to the path of democracy. Francois Mitterrand added in a slightly controversial tone: I did not come a few years ago when other French politicians were turning up in Bucharest one after another.

A new subject broached by the president of the Republic during his news conference concerning the rights of minorities—a reference to the Hungarian minority in Romania, but also to the Kurds.

[Begin Mitterrand recording] We have just seen regarding the Kurds that it is very important for a status to be defined that permits all minorities to be respected. That does not mean, however, that we are in favor of the breaking-up, the dispersal, the bursting apart, of existing states—(?we would reject this). It would be an altogether arbitrary and illusory view. It is just that what is needed—I said this recently—is for each person to feel happy where he is. He will be happy if he feels his rights are respected. [end recording]

Francois Mitterrand is due to leave Bucharest in a few minutes to go to Iasi, the stronghold of President Iliescu. The head of state will return to Paris later today.

Leaves for Iasi With Iliescu

AU1904160691 Bucharest Domestic Service in Romanian 1500 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] President Francois Mitterrand, together with President Ion Iliescu, left for Iasi this afternoon to participate in the opening of the French Cultural Center. The program includes a visit to Iasi University, to the memorial house of General [name indistinct], as well as to [name indistinct] Monastery where he will meet with the Metropolitan of Moldavia.

During his visit to Iasi, the prefect of Iasi will present the president of France with the key of the city.

Meets Press on Kurdish Problem

LD1904190291 Paris Domestic Service in French 1600 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] The French president honored the victims of the Romanian revolution and Jean-Louis Calderon, one of our colleagues from La Cinq, killed during the events of December 1989, whose name has been given to a street in Bucharest. We recall that the Romanian opposition did not appreciate this visit by Francois Mitterrand, which, according to them, serves as support for the current Romanian regime. In a news conference, Francois Mitterrand referred to the Kurdish problem: There is no question of violating the principle of Iraq's sovereignty, said the head of state, but neither is there any question of letting people die without any help.

[Begin Mitterrand recording] The right of sovereignty of states must be honored, but there is a point at which the negation of the basic human right to live... [changes

thought] and life is not just physical life, it is also the intellectual life, it is also culture. It must be protected against crimes, barbarism, genocide, and so on. We are, thus, there, we are witnessing the birth of a right which is new, but is of considerable importance, and there, in Iraq, it is, in fact, the French, and the countries which you have mentioned—Great Britain and the United States—but it is increasingly the United Nations, via its secretary general, which defines the clauses which permit the success of this new right. [end recording]

Roland Dumas, who is currently in Bucharest at the side of Francois Mitterrand, will return to Paris this evening for talks with UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar on developing the aid operation established for the Kurdish refugees.

Praises Democracy, Departs

LD1904190491 Paris Domestic Service in French 1700 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Francois Mitterrand left Romania after an official two-day visit. In Bucharest, the head of state expressed the view that the young Romanian democracy was on the right road today and should be fully reintegrated into the big European family. The president of the Republic added that Romania's progress toward democracy was irreversible, even if it may still experience delays and drawbacks. [passage omitted]

Opposition Leaders View Meeting With Mitterrand

AU1904221691 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1957 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 19/4/1991—After their meeting with the French president, prominent members of the opposition made statements to the press:

Corneliu Coposu, president of the National Peasant Party: "The presence of President Mitterrand here is a great honour for this country and a great joy for the Romanian people. However, the moment chosen casts a shadow on this joy as it sanctions an unpopular, non-representative and speed-losing government. Therefore President Mitterrand's visit to Bucharest just drags on the agony of a contested government. I informed President Mitterrand about our reserves as to the beginnings of democratisation, privatisation, we pointed out the failure of this government to master the serious economic crisis we are experiencing and we demanded that the assistance Romania so badly needs from France should be granted to representative governments, born of free elections, because the elections claimed to have legitimised this government were a sham and a fake. President Mitterrand met these reserves with surprise and further promised France's help to Romania.

Radu Campeanu, president of the National Liberal Party: "I am of the opinion that President Francois Mitterrand's visit comes at a totally wrong moment and therefore appears as an unconditional vote of confidence to the present government and to the political power of the moment, which is contrary to the general will of the Romanian people these days."

Victor Surdu, president of the Agrarian Democratic Party: "We have had maybe the unique chance to meet the president of France. He wishes us good and I hope his wishes come true. I hope Premier Roman's intentions to form a coalition government would be treated seriously and that the opposition forces will join this new government through people that know life in Romania first hand and are willing to give a helping hand to the Romanian people."

Opposition Calls Mitterrand's Visit 'Untimely'

LD1904152791 Paris Antenne-2 Television Network in French 1100 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] [Lefait] The visit to Romania by Francois Mitterrand is no smooth sailing. The French head of state expressed willingness of Paris to support Romania. Even if he stressed the need to further democracy and freedom in the country, the opposition contested this visit. Francois Mitterrand was booed by demonstrating students. Furthermore, prominent dissident Doina Cornea asked him to avoid backing President Iliescu's regime. More details now from our special correspondents Stephane Mannier and Yves Barbe:

[Reporter] One was expecting a day of full of events, and one witnessed a ballet of niceties. Mitterrand's breakfast with the parliamentarian opposition was planned to reassure the latter: France came to help the democratic process in Romania. Obviously Francois Mitterrand was unable to be fully persuasive.

[Begin recording of Radu Campeanu, president of the Romanian Liberal Party] His visit is wholly untimely because it leaves the definitive impression of unconditional support to the present government, a government whose resignation was demanded by 75 percent of the population. [end recording]

[Reporter] The second stopover was a ceremony to honor Jean-Louis Calderon, our colleague from La 5 [French fifth televison channel] tragically killed during the 1989 revolution, who became a hero in Romania. The emotion was present, but not the great popular fervor. The crowd was waiting, it was awaiting the speech delivered in Parliament.

[Begin Mitterrand recording] We, the French, attach importance to reestablishing an obvious fact: Romania is in Europe, and nowhere else! [end recording]

[Reporter] It was what was not being said that was most significant. Francois Mitterrand did not want to give a lecture on democracy to the Romanians; this crowd did not understand. The motorcade was booed in front of the polytechnic school as if it was expected that President Mitterrand would start another revolution.

Newspapers View French President's Visit

AU1804193091 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1804 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—The Bucharest dailies of April 18 carry extensive curtain-raisers on the visit the French president is to start today in Romania, coming up with various opinions:

DIMINEATA (Pro-presidential): Considering that in spite of affinities and traditions that have tied Romania to France for centuries, their relations witnessed a tangible recession in the last decade of Ceausescu's dictatorship, when President Mitterrand refused to meet with "the Carpathians' genius" in order to give him the bail other Western heads of state had given without caring too much, the visit acquires a quite special significance (...) we will note that it is a political action expressing the growing interest shown in Romania in the general context of France's rapprochement to the formerly communist states in Central and Eastern Europe (...) through the recognition of the irreversible course taken by the young Romanian democracy and the belonging of new Romania to the community of the European states that wish to build a real common home, the last remains of the walls of isolation and petrification that alienated us from Europe are toppled and removed.

AZI (pro-governmental): Going beyond the traditional framework of Romanian-French friendship, Francois Mitterrand's visit is a token of confidence in the wish and capability of Romania, of the authorities elected on May 20, 1990 to advance on the road to democracy, of establishing a state of law.

ADEVARUL (Independent): France, that was from the first moments on the side of the December Romanian revolution proves again truthful to itself. Invitations were extended to the French president also in the past, but they were turned down, which meant keeping at a significant distance a regime [word indistinct] policy of French democracy could not agree. For the political gesture of that time and for the gesture of today we can only say: merci la France, merci Monsieur le president.

DREPTATEA ("Rostrum of Fight Against Communism", organ of the Christian Democratic National Peasant Party): Beyond the emotion that seized France, expressed in various spectacular political games proceeded from the onset under the token of a delicate astonishment. No governmental official coming from Paris to Bucharest thought it fit to get in touch also with the opposition, for instance. The unconditional support given to Prime Minister Roman, to the Iliescu regime went that far as not even the June 13-15, 1990 events changed the stand of the French rules (...) of course, Romania's political and economic relations with France are very important, especially for us we do not have a satisfactory image of the economic collaboration, and politically, Mr. Mitterrand's action was confined to a warm introduction of the National Salvation Front to the Socialist International, to receiving Mr. Roman at the Elysee several times, to strictly formal interviews with Mr. Iliescu (...) Mr. Mitterrand is, as is known, a consistent pan-European champion and of this idea, he meets with Mr. Gorbachev, another outspoken supporter of the European home (...) Is it possible that Mr. Mitterrand wishes to discuss such matters in Bucharest? Maybe just touch it, as the idea is still too new and not [word indistinct] for us. Rather, we think they will approach aspects of economic cooperation and of the French support to Romania's rapprochement to Europe (...)

ROMANIA LIBERA (Independent, opposition): After the December revolution, France was culturally the most active of all West-European countries in Romania. Many of the bills submitted to the Parliament for endorsement upon the government's initiatives are of French inspiration and a failure of the government would be in a way also France's failure. Hence also the role France has assumed in the Council of Europe, a role obviously in favor of Mr. Petre Roman's political demarche. Maybe it will be some time before France's president will understand that Romania's interests in Europe are not transient, like the governments and ministers, and France's interests in the Romanian political [word indistinct] need more a skillful administrator than a clever handsome with fine conversation.

We do not doubt in any way the French president's good intentions, but his disregard of the events of June 13-15, of the May 20, 1990 elections and the slandering campaign started by the National Salvation Front against the opposition, prior to and after elections is not of a nature to keep our minds at peace about the political support he is giving now to the power established in Romania to the Iliescu-Roman pair who are going to fail themselves, with or without French support. (...) anyway, the opposition is far from looking enthusiastic about Mr. Francois Mitterrand's visit in Romania.

Economic Cooperation Discussed With France

AU1804194091 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1834 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 18/4/1991—In the afternoon of April 18 Mr. Eugen Dijmarescu, minister secretary of state in charge of economic orientation, received Mme. Elisabeth Guigou, minister delegate of the French Republic for European Affairs, with whom he discussed aspects of the Romanian-French economic collaboration and of the financial support France is granting Romania to implement the economic reform programme as well as questions related to the technical assistance the French Government and French enterprises give Romania in the sphere of economic restructuring and staff training.

During the talk aspects were also approached linked to the multilateral economic and financial assistance Romania has been granted by the European communities and the Group of 24.

Prime Minister on Economy, Foreign Cooperation

PM2204073091 Paris LE FIGARO in French 18 Apr 91 p 3

[Interview with Prime Minister Petre Roman by Jean-Jacques Mevel in Bucharest; date not given]

[Text] [Mevel] What are you expecting from Francois Mitterrand's visit?

[Roman] Above all, it is a resounding confirmation of the renewal of Franco-Romanian relations. From the start, President Mitterrand has attached importance to the cause of the Romanian revolution. He subsequently demonstrated that many times. I am awaiting his visit with great emotion.

[Mevel] The French president is the first Western head of state to visit Romania. Is this the end of isolation for you 10 months after the violent march on Bucharest by the miners?

[Roman] Yes. I hope that this visit will mark the end of doubts regarding Romania. President Mitterrand and some of his close aides realized that a very delicate period was inevitable after the revolution.

[Mevel] Many treaties of friendship are being signed in Europe at the moment. Why has Romania decided to be the only country to sign such a document with the USSR?

[Roman] First, I will give you a fact: Romania and the USSR have a common border 1,000 km long. Above all, this treaty sets the seal on a radical transformation in relations between the two countries, without a military alliance, and without any ideological reference. It enables Romania to deal with the problems dear to it, particularly those of Moldova.

[Mevel] Will Moldova become Romanian again one day?

[Roman] Moldova is Romanian! It is just not part of the Romanian state. It is a sovereign, perhaps even independent republic. The Soviet-Romanian treaty explicitly mentions the right of each of the two countries to support the development of democracy in the neighboring country. It is therefore a document which enables us to extend our relations with Moldavia at all levels.

[Mevel] There is still talk of preferential relations between Bucharest and Paris. Are you disappointed to see that France has chosen Poland for its first treaty of friendship with an Eastern European country?

[Roman] Yes, on an emotional level. Relations between France and Romania have not lived up to the French enthusiasm during the revolution. It is true that I would have liked Romania to sign its first treaty of friendship with France. Nonetheless, that is not very important!

[Mevel] Is a treaty being drawn up between Romania and France?

[Roman] Romania proposed that on 14 March. I think it is almost concluded. I hope that it will be signed during Francois Mitterrand's visit.

[Mevel] What place have you reserved for France in the Romanian economic recovery?

[Roman] At first, it was an enormous place, but the businessmen and industrialists did not come in such large numbers as we had hoped. There is a place for the French. It is not guaranteed.

[Mevel] The Romanians are discovering that the economic reforms mean first inflation, unemployment, and the persistence of shortages. How long do you have to redress the balance?

[Roman] In my view, economic recovery is possible this year and next year. That is a tolerable period of time.

[Mevel] Do you want a coalition government to implement the economic reforms?

[Roman] Absolutely. We have already proposed that several times. This has not happened for two reasons: The opposition parties have limited support and excessive ambitions. The National Salvation Front has just proposed a government with the participation of the opposition parties. That is entirely desirable.

[Mevel] In other words, you are proposing a sharing of responsibilities for a period which promises to be difficult....

[Roman] Precisely.

[Mevel] Who are the opponents of the reforms in Romania?

[Roman] They are both individuals and mentalities. It is impossible to exclude somebody because he belonged to the communist administration, but he must go if he persists in using old methods. That is the most important obstacle to the reforms.

Iliescu Makes Statement on Arrival From London

AU1704094191 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0915 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 17/4/1991—In a short statement made at the Otopeni Airport, on his arrival from London where he attended the inaugural ceremony of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, President Ion Iliescu appreciated that event as very important in the continent's political life.

Referring to the many contacts he had with politicians and businessmen, the president showed that he could see openness and more realistic stands in connection with the processes in Romania, of real interest to develop the relations on all planes: "Political openness, and what we are more interested in, economic openness for contacts, for the expansion of bilateral and multilateral ties, for

cooperation actions with prestigious companies which could help us in the economic process."

Expanded Trade Ties With Britain Viewed

AU1704180291 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1555 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 17/4/1991—There are many companies with which we already have commercial relations, such as is [as received] the British airspace, for instance, stated President Ion Iliescu in an interview with Romanian and foreign journalists after the meeting at the London-based Confederation of British Industry. There is a team of the company in Bucharest now to work out a new program of collaboration with our specialty enterprises. The Rolls Royce representative, participant in the meeting, wishes cooperation with these enterprises. Mr. Mitchell, who was in Bucharest and knows our industry very well, will come to Romania next June for direct contacts with our enterprises specializing in turbo-mechanics of engines. Land Rover, Xerox, that have had fine relations with our countries, are also involved in such activities.

There are many projects in agriculture and food industry: The relevant British minister was in Romania a few days ago and had very specific talks at the Ministry of Agriculture in Romania for the promotion of a big number of projects in this domain. Other companies present here were interested in the modality of entering into business and setting up joint ventures.

Tourism, too, was one of the subjects discussed. There is a company that cooperates with a French one in the project of modernization of a central hotel in Bucharest, the Lido, and this is other one of our priorities, I mean tourism and the development of the infrastructure for tourism. So, we give priority to food industry and agriculture, to tourism.

Answering a question as to whether there is more confidence in the realities in Romania now, Romania's president stressed that generally the businessmen are far more practical and they start from the concrete interest of business. I think, he said, that Romania is better, ever better seen from the Thames banks.

FEC's Pregl Interviewed on New Proposals

AU1704101791 Belrade NIN in Serbo-Croatian 12 Apr 91 pp 16, 17

[Interview with Federal Executive Council member Zivko Pregl by Vesna Kostic; place and date not given: "A Government Without a State"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Kostic] Can the government govern?

[Pregl] If, on the one hand, you look at what the Federal Executive Council [FEC] has done in the last two years and several days and on the other, consider its actual powers, I am sure that any analyst would be amazed at what we have achieved. We have not complained about the lack of powers. We thought that we must offer attractive solutions that everyone will adopt. This worked very nicely for quite a long time. Since the end of last year, we have indeed found ourselves at a stage where the legal and economic systems are being eroded, so the question arises of whether the government can govern. Moreover, there is the very real danger of anarchy and chaos. Our strength has rested on the force of arguments and on monetary and foreign trade policy. Now that this has begun to erode too, the question is being raised of how we continue to work. It is our intention also because of this to raise these questions in the Assembly soon—either-or: Either the basic things will be respected that the FEC is demanding for normal work, or we will propose that other people are found to do this job.

[Kostic] Is the government functioning in its full composition? I ask you this because of confusion about General Kadijevic's participation in the work of the FEC.

[Pregl] You see, this was really a new element in the work of this FEC—that in contrast to their predecessors in previous governments, the federal secretary for national defense, the federal secretary for foreign affairs, and the federal secretary for internal affairs have regularly taken part in the government's sessions. It should also be sincerely said that they always make a very important contribution to creating the reform ideas that the FEC presents. This also goes for the federal secretary for national defense. To tell the truth, he has not attended some of the recent sessions, but no dramatic conclusions should be drawn from that. You know that the situation is such that the Federal Secretariat for National Defense and its chief too, that is the federal secretary for national defense, have a string of obligations and responsibilities to the SFRY Presidency. This is simply a question of some physical, human limitations, so he now attends the government's sessions less often, but the federal secretary for national defense is always represented—by the deputy federal secretary or some other senior official in the Federal Secretariat for National Defense. Therefore, the issue of the cooperation of the Federal Secretariat for National Defense in the FEC is not being raised.

[Kostic] What new thing will the FEC president be offering to the SFRY Assembly in the middle of the month?

[Pregl] I will not tell you all the new elements. This is for two reasons: First, one should always count to some extent on the element of surprise in politics, and second, we are still formulating our proposals for the federal Assembly. It can immediately be said, however, that the essence of our proposals is a plan on how to implement our program of "11 plus three points." This is a question of the appropriate legal proposals and some proposals that are more an expression of the attitude of the FEC with the aim of ensuring that the state functions. We have been conducting intensive talks with the republics in the last few days. This has introduced quite a lot of new things into our proposals.

[Kostic] Will the prime minister be suggesting at this session that it be decided "either-or."?

[Pregl] There is definitely no longer any reason to delay deciding on this key dilemma. The FEC has so far never said that it cannot do its job and has so far never complained about its powers. Yet attacks on the FEC have become more frequent. While they were only verbal, we did not worry much and we are not worrying now. We are doing our job; however, now that the possibility of the state functioning has really been decisively undermined, it is quite clear that we have to ask ourselves whether political willingness exists to find solutions in a peaceful democratic way, or whether someone wants to lead this country into chaos? [passage omitted]

[Kostic] Is the FEC working on the Federal Chamber's decision to work out the final accounts for disassociation?

[Pregl] With all due respect for the highest delegate body in the country, I would like to comment on this. All figures on the state of the foreign currency reserves, on the state of the country's foreign currency obligations to other countries, on its internal debts—all these figures are available to the delegates. The balances exist for the country's accounts. Now, the question of dividing this up and distributing it is no longer a question for experts but a question of a political decision that cannot be made by the FEC, nor is the FEC prepared to think about this. [passage omitted]

Markovic, Mesic Asked About Program

AU1904181791 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1700 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Here are statements by some participants in today's session of the SFRY Assembly. Our journalist Olivija Rusovac addressed Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic, SFRY Presidency Vice President Stipe Mesic, and several delegates. They all express different impressions of today's event.

[Rusovac] (?Mr.) Markovic, what were your feelings entering this hall today.

[Markovic] Normal.

[Rusovac] Do you think that you will receive the consensus of the republics for this program.

[Markovic] This is so much in the interest of everybody in the country, that rejecting it would be equal to suicide and I think that citizens of our country are not in a suicidal mood.

[Rusovac] We asked Petar Sale about the ratio between the dinar and the German mark.

[Sale] Well, I think that it is not bad. It could perhaps be increased a bit because of tourism. [passage omitted]

[Rusovac] What are the impressions of Presidency Vice President Stipe Mesic about Markovic's expose?

[Mesic] You see, today I saw only the first outline of his speech. I am not sure that I will agree with everything. I am going to suggest some additions. We shall see.

[Rusovac] What will be the attitude of the SFRY Presidency to (?this program)?

[Mesic] I do not know what the Presidency will say, but I accept it. [passage omitted]

Markovic: Nation at Critical Point of Reform

LD1904183691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1453 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic today said that Yugoslavia was "at a most critical point of the reform," and accused the leaders of the Yugoslav republics of preventing the success of the reform with their policies.

In his state of the nation address in the federal parliament, Prime Minister Markovic sharply criticized the policies of the leaders of the republics of Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia, and said that the opponents of the reform had "united."

"National conflicts have acquired such proportions, intensity and motives that the public is constantly being kept on the verge of a civil war," Markovic said.

"Europe has let us clearly know that it cannot imagine six separate Yugoslav entities and that nobody can expect to get to the European integrations before others by a shortcut," the Yugoslav federal prime minister said.

Markovic announced changes in the Federal Government's economic programme, whose aim he said was to enable the further implementation of the reform. Thus, for instance, the Yugoslav dinar has been devalued and made convertible again.

Pace of Reform, Social Conflict Viewed

LD1904184991 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1649 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic today criticized the leaders of the Yugoslav republics for preventing the success of the Federal Government reforms for their own political reasons.

"We are at a most critical point of the reform," Prime Minister Markovic said in his state of the nation address in the federal parliament, in which he identified the causes of the standstill in the reforms and announced changes in the Federal Government's economic policy, which are to enable the reforms to continue.

Prime Minister Markovic said that a prerequisite for the continuation of the interrupted reforms was the adoption of the Federal Government programme of the functioning of the federal system in the transitional period, that is, until a new accord on Yugoslavia's order is reached.

Prime Minister Markovic called for federal elections which would enable the federal parliament to adopt amendments to the federal constitutiton, which he said were indispensable if the reforms were further to be pursued.

Markovic said that political parties in Yugoslavia's republics, "in the interest of their own victories, often and unscrupulously supported the resistances to the transformation of society" and, thereby, undermined the country's legal and economic order.

The federal prime minister set out that the privatization process was being slowed down in the Yugoslav republics, and that it had come to a halt in the republics of Slovenia, Croatia and Montenegro.

"Under the veil of the protection of social ownership and social justice...an attempt is made at creating a new economic basis for a totalitarian authority by turning social ownership into state ownership," Prime Minister Markovic warned.

Markovic said that, in the parts of the country which had become "distinctly autonomous," the republican states were increasingly relying on "the strategy of force and coercion" in resolving social conflicts.

"That accounts for the priority demands of the state bodies in all republics for their own armed forces, in the form of conventional armies or police and similar formations," Markovic said.

He warned that the legal systems of the Yugoslav republics often provided the basis for "repression or protection, discrimination or privileges, depending on nationality, religion, or political commitment."

The federal prime minister said: "The human rights and freedoms of the ehtnic Albanians in Kosovo are at the

lowest level, and the living conditions of Serbs and Montenegrins, who have been suppressed for years, have not been improved either."

Prime Minister Markovic said that "the ambitions of the ruling party" in Croatia "immediately to carry out its programme, whose central point is the creation of a national state, with all attributes of a sovereign authority and with pronounced national traits, have caused mistrust, fear and resistance among the population of Serbian nationality."

The federal prime minister said: "Viewed on the whole, the Yugoslav People's Army has remained within the frameworks of its constitutional position, recognizing the realities of democratic processes in the country."

He also mentioned "counter-productive processes, such as the bringing of tanks out in the streets of Belgrade, about which the government had not been even informed."

"The realization is maturing in the Yugoslav People's Army that the successful implementation of reforms is a condition for the survival of Yugoslavia and, consequently, of itself," he said.

Markovic recalled that the Federal Government had always advocated a peaceful and tolerant way of dealing with all controversial issues connected with the future of Yugoslavia. "The main world message is that the only solution is the survival of Yugoslavia upon democratic foundations," he pointed out.

"It has been emphasized that problems cannot be settled by disintegration of the country and that only a reformed and democratic Yugoslavia can be a partner," the prime minister said.

"Europe is going along the path of integration, while we struggle with problems of disintegration," Markovic pointed out. "Europe made it clear that it cannot imagine having relations with six separate Yugoslav entities and that no one can expect to reach the European integration by a shortcut ahead of the others," he stressed.

Markovic called attention to the IMF's readiness to sign an agreement on a new stand-by arrangement with Yugoslavia, provided the republics accepted the programme of the Federal Government and take the necessary powers for its implementation.

He added that the European Community had decided to initiate Yugoslavia's association with it. "Europe is not only extending a helping hand to get us out of the crisis—it reasonably reminds us where our own, and its, interest lies," said the prime minister.

Parliamentary debate on Markovic's report has been scheduled for April 24 and 26.

Army Plans To Use All Means To Execute Tasks

LD2004020691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1611 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Secretariat for National Defence [word indistinct] Yugoslav People's Army (YPA) [JNA] cannot and [word indistinct] not tolerate attacks on its members, military facilities and equipment.

"The Yugoslav People's Army will use all available means in self-defence and in carrying out its functional tasks, in accordance with the law and regulations," said the Secretariat in reply to a question by a deputy to the federal chamber of the bicameral Yugoslav parliament.

The question was put in connection with the "blockade and isolation of individual garrisons in Croatia" and the "threatening of the mobility units and security of soldiers and officers" in this Yugoslav republic.

"The consequences that may follow from defence of the YPA interests will be borne by those who stand behind the attacks on the Army, regardless of who they may be," the Secretariat stressed.

It repeated that the YPA cannot bear full responsibility for the possible further illegal arming of citizens and their military organization in whatever part of Yugoslavia's territory.

The Secretariat recalled that the "Yugoslav state Presidency did not accept a proposal of necessary measures for the implementation of its own order of January 9 this year" on the disarming of all paramilitary units in Yugoslavia.

The Secretariat responded to a deputy's question about the mobilization of Serbia's reserve police force by the information it had received from the interior [words indistinct] Yugoslav republic.

Croatia's Mesic on Crisis, Army Role

AU1904135991 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 19 Apr 91 p 4

[Interview with Croatia's Stipe Mesic, next chairman of the Yugoslav State Presidency, by Maren Koester-Hetzendorf; place and date not given: "Serbia Is Directly Involved in Creating a Crisis in Croatia"]

[Text] [Koester-Hetzendorf] It will be your turn to take over the chairmanship of the Yugoslav State Presidency for a year on 15 May. Will you be the last state president of the federation of Yugoslavia?

[Mesic] I do not expect that I will be the last one. During my term of office the agreements on the future coexistence of the state subjects of the Yugoslav community will be concluded. To organize this coexistence, a longer period will be necessary.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] The presidents of the six republics have decided to hold a referendum on the new order in Yugoslavia in all republics by the end of May. Do you see this as a bit of progress?

[Mesic] This has not brought us closer to solving the crisis. On the contrary, we are still far away from that. Only the positions of all participants have been put on the table openly.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Slovenia wants to proclaim its independence on 23 June. What are your feelings about that?

[Mesic] It is a proclamation of what has been set down by the referendum in Slovenia. The statement of one side that it is leaving the state community does not mean much. It is like a marriage. If one person says he wants to leave, the marriage is not over. This is only an announcement that one wants to dissolve the marriage. Many questions have to be solved, in particular legal issues and issues relating to property.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] There is the view that the federal authorities of Yugoslavia are acting in a vacuum. The republics do what they want. Why does Yugoslavia actually still need a State Presidency?

[Mesic] The State Presidency and the federal authorities must work especially during the period in which we will reach agreements on the future organization. This includes representing the current federation abroad.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] What will the State Presidency do if the presidents are not able to solve the problems between Croats and Serbs in Croatia, for instance?

[Mesic] The presidents cannot solve this problem. This is the exclusive business of Croatia.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Does this also apply to Serbia in the case of Kosovo?

[Mesic] Kosovo is a constitutional element of the federation; therefore, it is illogical that the representatives of Serbia speak in the name of Kosovo when the future of Yugoslavia is discussed.

At the moment, Kosovo is represented in the Presidency by the vice president of the Serbian Assembly. This is in contradiction to the federal Constitution. There it is said that if the representative of an autonomous province is not able to attend the sessions of the State Presidency, the chairman of the provincial leadership must deputize for him. Serbia has withdrawn Riza Sapundziju, the representative of Kosovo in the State Presidency. This does not have any legal basis, because Sapundziju was delegated to the Presidency by the legislature in Kosovo. Serbia has abolished the Kosovo legislature and has elected a new representative for Kosovo from among its own ranks. This is not legitimate.

We are now waiting for a decision by the Federal Constitutional Court.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Is the work of the Presidency hindered by that?

[Mesic] Yes. A good part of the work of the State Presidency is not legitimate.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] The economic situation in Yugoslavia is precarious. In March the Presidency held an expanded session, which was attended by Prime Minister Ante Markovic and the presidents of the republics to discuss a program of measures. Other countries already spoke of an EC model for Yugoslavia. What happened to that?

[Mesic] Prime Minister Ante Markovic only presented the 11-point program at the session. The federal legislature must adopt the measures.

The State Presidency is blocked because there is still a 4:4 position. No decision can be made. Serbia wants to block the work of the Presidency and of the federal authorities. It has imposed the economic blockade against Slovenia and Croatia and has created customs barriers. Serbia is directly involved in creating the crisis in Croatia. Milosevic admits that he is in daily contact with Milan Babic, the rebel leader of the Serbs in Knin. They want to create a situation in which the Yugoslav institutions do not work any more. They want to create a situation in which the Army plays the arbiter—the Army, which is supposed to establish Greater Serbia by force.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Can you guarantee that under your presidency the Army will not be used in internal conflicts, such as in Plitvice?

[Mesic] When I am president the possibility of an Army intervention will be very low. (Current President) Jovic made a maneuver. He called the members of the Presidency and said that there was a danger of civil war. I will not participate in such a game.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Much excitement has been caused by the case of the Croatian Defense Minister Spegelj, whom the Yugoslav Defense Ministry accuses of illegal arms purchases for arming paramilitary forces. Is this also the business of the State Presidency as the commander in chief of the Army?

[Mesic] The Croatian government was unable to get weapons for its police forces from domestic sources. The government then passed this task on to the interior and the defense ministers. They bought the weapons. It is not necessary to hold a trial. It is Croatia's legitimate right to arm its police. The State Presidency has nothing to do with that.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] Many people abroad are uncertain whether they should spend their vacations in Yugoslavia, in view of the tensions, in particular in Croatia. What can you tell these people?

[Mesic] The safety of tourists in vacation resorts will not be in danger. It is clear that some of the tourists will not

come because of the situation. This reduces Croatia's financial means. But it also reduces the sums that Croatia is supposed to pay to the Army, and the sums that underdeveloped villages, such as Knin and others, were supposed to get. The villages that rebel are hurting themselves. Plitvice is a typical example. The nature preserve was the most successful enterprise. At Easter 3,500 tourists did not come. If the people understand that one cannot live off Milosevic's promises, they will solve their problem themselves. It would be good if the militant groups were taken over by Milosevic. Let them sit in Belgrade, if he loves them so much.

[Koester-Hetzendorf] You are a well-known supporter of the idea of a confederation. How is this compatible with becoming president of the federation?

[Mesic] I am a legitimist. As long as the federation exists, I am in favor of its functioning well.

Mesic on Advantages of Union

AU2204102391 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 17 Apr 91 p 8

[Evica Kostovska report: "Toward Europe Without Borders"]

[Excerpts] Zagreb—SFRY Presidency Vice President Stipe Mesic opened the Zagreb spring international fair yesterday. The fair consists of eight specialized fairs in which 2000 exhibitors from all over Yugoslavia and from 22 countries of Europe, Asia, and North America, are taking part. [passage omitted]

Greeting the biggest gathering of businessmen that is currently held in our country, Mesic pointed out that this gathering was not being held at a time of perfect political peace. "It would have been better, if we had had a better consensus, if we could compete among ourselves and go to Europe together, and than compete there," Mesic stressed. [passage omitted]

"Many people fear a union of sovereign states although we all know that we are not satisfied with the present model. The union of sovereign states would make it possible for everybody to develop, but this would be a development without borders—as we know what it means to enter the Europe without borders— while the regional development would enable full development for every nation. In such a case, nobody would worry, even the issue of the national minorities would no longer be problematic," Mesic emphasized. In connection with this he pointed at the Macedonian case. "The problem always emerges in Greece and Bulgaria, where the Macedonian national minorities exist," Mesic said. "By entering Europe, the borders would open for the entire Macedonian nation to live together, and in such a case it would not matter whether one lives in Salonika or Kavadarci.

"The same goes, it can be said, for the ambition of creating Greater Serbia with a great wall around Serbs. This would harm Serbs most. Ghettoization has never brought prosperity to anyone, so neither will it bring any to Serbs. Making enemies also cannot lead to happiness. That is why Serbs, Croats, and all other nations and ethnic groups of this country, would gain an entrance to the world and an entrance to Europe by deciding for the union of sovereign states. They would achieve open borders and unlimited possibilities. That is why we believe in a peaceful solution to our crisis and in even better results," Mesic concluded.

Izetbegovic Explains Absence From News Conference

AU1804120291 Sarajevo OSLOBODJENJE in Serbo-Croatian 13 Apr 91 p 5

[Report on interview with Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency President Alija Izetbegovic by Rajko Zivkovic; place and date not given: "Historic Blindness, or Something Else"]

[Excerpt] Bosnia-Hercegovina Presidency President Alija Izetbegovic returned to Sarajevo immediately after the meeting of the six republican presidents in Brdo near Kranje. He did not take part in the news conference like the other five presidents who waited more than three hours for the news conference to begin.

We asked him what were the reasons for leaving Brdo before the other five sovereign presidents?

"First of all, the meeting lasted longer than planned. It was supposed to end at 1800, the time scheduled for the news conference. Also, I was in contact with the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina because I wanted to know how the work of the legislature was going. I was told that the session was tumultuous at times and therefore I could not wait for the meeting in Brdo to end so I could return to Sarajevo to see what was happening. I was informed that the work of the assembly was interrupted because of what happened in Banja Luka, namely the discovery of a shipment of weapons, and controversial stories about it. I had the impression that the situation was quite serious. On the other hand, I did not see the point, to be honest, in staying at the conference because, at least in my view, we had not achieved anything. Despite all the efforts made in the last 13 days of negotiations, we are still in the situation to chose between two options. However hard we tried to bring the views closer—the Serbian and Montenegrin stands, on the one hand, and the Croatian and Slovene stands, on the other—to a compromise that would appear to us more logical than the existing two, our proposals fell on deaf ears. In that situation, in order not to say something that I did not want to say, I decided to leave for these two reasons." Iztebegovic stated this yesterday at the beginning of his interview to Sarajevo radio and OSLOBODJENJE.

Our Own "Apartheid"

Commenting on the agreement reached in Brdo to hold a referendum (plebiscite), Izetbegovic said:

"This should certainly be a referendum of citizens. I am not aware that a referendum of peoples has ever been organized anywhere in the world. A referendum of peoples would leave numerous questions unanswered, such as what would happen to the people who are not members of the three main groups of peoples in Bosnia-Hercegovina (there are many Yugoslavs, Albanians, Romanies...). It would be shocking for the democratic public at home and abroad if in this way we excluded a large number of people, citizens with full civil rights, from this democratic process, as was, for instance done by Milosevic at the news conference when he compared Krajina and Kosovo—something I could never do—saying that Albanians could not have the same rights as Serbs. This is a kind of 'apartheid' which we could never accept." [passage omitted]

Izetbegovic Rejects Breakup of Bosnia-Hercegovina

AU2004163691 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1300 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Ljubomir Nikolic report from Banja Luka]

[Text] At the goodwill meeting for Bosnia-Hercegovina, which was organized in Banja Luka by the Party of Democratic Action [SDA], Alija Izetbegovic decisively rejected the idea of the regionalization and breaking up of Bosnia-Hercegovina. This meeting was attended by more than 50,000 Muslims from different parts of Bosnia-Hercegovina.

[Nikolic] "Peace is everything"; "We would sacrifice peace for Bosnia-Hercegovina"; "Bosnia is a sovereign state"; "For sovereignty, equality, and peace." These are only some of the messages on the numerous banners which, along with green flags with a crescent moon and star, joined republican chess boards, flags of the SDA, and the odd Yugoslav flag, made up the backdrop of today's meeting in the center of Banja Luka.

Over tumultuous chanting of: "We do not give up the Krajina"; "This is not Serbia"; "This is Bosnia," and so on, Alija Izetbegovic, SDA president, said, in speaking about the attempt by Serbian communes in the Bosnian Krajina to form an association, that the only disagreement lies in the fact that Muslims want to settle all disputed issues together with Serbs and Croats, and in the republican government and Assembly, but Serbs are making major decisions by themselves.

Difficult times are here when you do not know what your neighbor thinks and wants, Izetbegovic said, adding that Bosnia is a mixture and it is not being broken up. He sent the message to their neighbors that Muslims want to share good and evil with them, but that they will never agree to being second-class citizens of a national minority in the communes predominantly inhabited by Serbs.

We need warm hearts and cool heads, Alija Izetbegovic said, and ended his speech with the words: We swear to the great God that we will not be slaves.

According to Fikret Abdic, the economic program of the Bosnia-Hercegovina government, which will be discussed the day after tomorrow by deputies in the republican assembly, offers the foundations of development to all parts of the republic and it should be jointly examined, supplemented, and adopted.

Introduced as vice president of the Yugoslav Assembly, Irfan Ajanovic, SDA secretary, said that the Bosnian Krajina will never fall and will remain part of the state of Bosnia-Hercegovina. Calling on Serb and Croat brothers to reach an agreement with Muslims and a joint settlement of their own destiny, Ajanovic said: Muslims will never be Kurds.

Rusmir Mahmutcehajic and Muhamed Cengic, two vice presidents of the republican government, spoke in the same way.

There were also strong security forces in Banja Luka today too. To avoid interethnic conflicts, the Serbian Democratic Party appealed to its members to avoid Banja Luka streets and not to go to this town.

However, the town fears a meeting between the (?Whites) from Knin and western Krajina towns, who will be coming to this evening's football match between Bor and Crvena Zvezda, and participants in today's meeting in Banja Luka.

Slovenia's Separation Denied International Support

AU2104184991 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0800 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Dragoslav Kosaric report on the "Sunday at 10" program from Ljubljana]

[Text] Slovenia is at a crossroads: How is one to form an independent state without the approval of the European and world public? This is a question to which Slovene experts are seeking an answer.

[Kosaric] The principled and firm stand of the EEC and the United States, as well as other international institutions have made the Slovene top political leadership, together with the leaders of all parties in the assembly meet behind closed doors and analyze the new situation, because 23 June, called D-day of the Slovene independent state, is getting closer. After this Last Supper [tajna vecera] of the creators of the Slovene people's destiny, one can detect a change in the strategy of reaching the set aim. Instead of harsh criticism and telling the EC that it is conservative, Slovenia has been trying other methods with a view to making the EC accept its view of the

Yugoslav crisis. It is in this context that one should view the trip Janez Drnovsek made to the United States, his talks with representatives of various international institutions, and lectures about Slovenia and Yugoslavia. Doubtlessly, Drnovsek was also given a clear reply: A united and complete Yugoslavia, regardless of internal agreements.

In Slovenia's view, however, Yugoslavia's breaking up into independent republican states is a basis for the realization of Slovene international strategy, and time will show whether that was the right move.

In the context of foreign pressures and warnings, the debate on separation [razdruzivanje], that is, secession [otcepljenje] from Yugoslavia was postponed; meanwhile, the Slovene Assembly adopted one of the more important documents needed for the republic to become independent, the Law on Military Service. The point was to say clearly that for the time being one does not plan to deviate from plebiscitary decisions. This law is doubtlessly undermining Yugoslavia's defense system.

At the same time, separation is spoken about as a process to be continued even after 23 June. It seems that the Slovene government is already looking for an excuse for the moment when it will have to say openly: That is simply impossible, particularly because of international relations. Peterle is aware of the fact that their state could find itself in a political and economic isolation, although it is said at the moment that it is ready to take that risk, as well. Apart from purely pragmatical reasons, the engagement of prominent professor Jeffrey Sachs was undoubtedly a political move and even more so because Sachs took part in drafting Ante Markovic's economic reform. Sachs did not promise milk and honey, but rather sweat and tears. His lecture in the Slovene Assembly was attended by about 50 deputies, which also tells much about the internal political relations in this republic. The basic, and the most dangerous dilemma to which there is so far no desirable answer is whether the breakup of Yugoslavia is the right trump for Slovenia to try to play, because the international public still does not want to let it join the game.

There are reactions, albeit individual, by Slovene intellectuals, who publicly criticize these moves.

Slovenia Will Withhold Federal Customs Duties

LD2104194491 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1810 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] Ljubljana, April 20 (TANJUG)—The director-general of the public accounting service of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia, Ivor Omerza, has stated that Slovenia does not intend to pay customs and other import duties into the federal treasury.

Omerza set out that the decision was in line with the conclusions adopted by the Slovene Assembly, as the daily DELO of Ljubjana, capital of Slovenia, writes today.

The Yugoslav federal government warning that it will take most decisive measures to ensure that the republican accounting services do their duty and directly pay the customs and other important duties into the federal treasury was described as irrelevant by Omerza.

"If the Federal Customs Bureau was to order customs officials in Slovenia not to let through goods which are subject to customs duties and if they were to respect such an order, the Slovene government would have to discipline them" Omerza stated to DELO.

Slovene Foreign Policy in 'Transitional' Period

AU1804094291 Ljubljana DELO in Slovene 5 Apr 91 p 2

[B.S. report: "We Have Good Chances of Gaining Foreign Recognition"]

[Text] Ljubljana, 4 Apr—A republican law on foreign affairs should also form one of the real contributions to the process of Slovenia's independence. The government today adopted a proposal to issue this law with basic principles, therefore the matter is now being processed further. Slovene Foreign Minister Dimitrij Rupel presented the law at today's news conference held after the government's session.

It is a fact that Slovenia's foreign affairs activities have increased considerably lately. They are no longer merely limited to regional and border cooperation, as Slovenia is no longer prepared to leave international, political, economic, financial, cultural, and scientific cooperation to federal authorities. Of course, Rupel was quite realistic on this point. He warned that in the process of independence one should count upon a certain transitional period, which should last until international recognition for Slovenia is achieved.

He agreed that there will be troubles at the beginning, but at the same time he was convinced that Slovenia has good chances of gaining international recognition. "We have received certain indications that tell us that we will not fall into a void," [Rupel] stated at the news conference. Of course, during this transitional period Slovenes will continue to use Yugoslav passports for travel abroad. These will only be replaced by Slovene passports when a certain number of states recognize Slovenia....

Rupel said that Slovenia will open about 20 to 25 missions abroad. At first (until international recognition) these would, of course, merely be a sort of bureau without diplomatic or consular status. We would use the existing Yugoslav network of diplomatic and consular missions abroad, which Slovenia would authorize to represent the Slovene state abroad.

There was also talk about sharing the joint property of the Yugoslav foreign service abroad. Slovenia would at this division demand a 20 to 25 percent share.

Military Service To Be Seven Months in Slovenia

LD1904102691 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2232 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Ljubljana, April 18 (TANJUG)—The parliament of the Yugoslav Republic of Slovenia today adopted a republican law on military service under which Slovenian conscripts will serve a seven-month tour of duty in their own republic.

Compusory service in the Yugoslav People's Army (YPA) [JNA] is 12 months. The Slovenian authorities decided some time ago that conscripts from this republic will serve in Slovenia.

The parliament also intructed the competent republican authorities to ask the federal authorities to release all slovenian conscripts currently in the YPA within one month's time after the republican law comes into effect.

The information secretariat said yesterday that the last generation of soldiers from Slovenia would complete their terms in the YPA by January 1992 at the latest.

The republican parliament said the new military service law was an important step along the route of Slovenia's separation from Yugoslavia.

Army District Denies Damage to Slovene Property

AU2004200791 Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 18 Apr 91 p 20

[HINA report: "The Yugoslav People's Army on Moving Out"]

[Text] Zagreb—"The arguments cited by the republican Secretariat for Information of the Republic of Slovenia concerning the Staff of the Territorial Defense of Slovenia moving out of the building at No. 4 Prezihova Street and into the '4 July' barracks in Ljubljana are untrue, disgraceful, and obviously calculated to create animosity toward the Yugoslav People's Army and its members." This is said in a statement by the Command of the Fifth Army District. "The truth is that the Staff of the Territorial Defense of the Republic of Slovenia had been in the building at No. 4 Prezihova Street, which is owned by Ljubljana Bank, since 1973 and always paid the rent regularly. Claims that the building was damaged when the Staff moved out and that equipment and utilities had been forcibly removed are also explicitly rejected." The Command of the Fifth Army District claims that "no furniture or equipment owned by the Republic of Slovenia was removed."

Draskovic Hearing Begins in Belgrade

LD2204120791 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1036 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, 22 Apr (TANJUG)—Belgrade's First District Court held a hearing today on the president of the Serbian Renaissance Movement [SPO], Vuk Draskovic, in the presence of 20-some lawyers. Investigating judge Milan Savic did not issue an investigation warrant (which means he, in effect, did not start criminal proceedings), but he will decide on whether to do so on a later date (something that happens very seldom).

In this investigative procedure Draskovic is accused of "being the ringleader of a group in his capacity as president of the SPO, calling for resistance to the measures taken by the state services, as well as calling on the other opposition parties to join him in this." These are criminal acts under Artical 216, paragraph two with regard to paragraph one, and Article 230, and also under paragraph two with regard to paragraph one of Sebia's penal code, which sanctions these acts with up to five years in prison, or 10 years. [sentence as received]

Journalists were not permitted to witness the hearing, nor were photographers allowed to take pictures. Draskovic entered the court room accompanied by the lawyers, including Srdja Popovic, Strahinja Kastratovic, Ilija Radulovic, Dragoslav Cetkovic, and Milenko Radic.

As we have learned from Draskovic's lawyers, Deputy Public Prosecutor Nebojsa Stoiljkovic bases his demand for starting proceedings on the following evidence: application for the 9 March rally, the document banning that rally, the conclusion of the city government on staging public meetings, the report on the dead, the SPO's leaflets, and the endorsed receipt for the items confiscated from participants in the rally. His lawyers also say the SPO leader did not want to reply to Judge Savic's questions while the prosecutor had no questions for the accused. In his short statement outside the court Vuk Draskovic stressed, however, that "I do not feel like a defendant, but like a prosecutor" and "that the authorized lawyers will not defend him, but the truth."

In another brief statement delivered immediately after the hearing he told TANJUG "that the trial perpetrators of the crime are hiding and defending, by using their positions and their Communist majority to outvote everyone else in the legislature, although nowhere in the world does a deputy's superiority in numbers decide on crimes. It is rather facts that do."

Conservative Party Founded; Supports Monarchy

LD1804205191 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1213 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Zrenjanin, 18 Apr (TANJUG)—The Conservative Party [Konzervativna Stranka] was founded today in Zrenjanin. A poet and philosopher from Belgrade, Milan Mladenovic, was elected the party chairman. The founding assembly also elected Djuro Zaric from Belgrade, Sinisa Nikolic from Novi Sad, Svetomir Milosevic from Zrenjanin, and Slobodan Mladenovic from Svetozarevo the party vice chairman. The party will be based in Belgrade.

The party's founding program is, as stressed in a statement from the meeting, "the shortest political program in the country." The Conservative Party is set up "with

the aim of preserving and reviving traditional religious, cultural, and civilized values nurtured by the Serbian, South Slva, and other Balkan nations." The party wants to prevent disintegration of the Yugoslav state and loss of its sovereignty.

Apart from this, the party "will through its activities prepare conditions for the renewal of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia headed by the legitimate exponent of sovereign power, i.e. the Karadjordjevic dynasty, which was toppled by force," the statement says among other things.

Rugova: Ethnic Albanians To Vote as a Nation

LD2004015791 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1505 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Pristina, April 19 (TANJUG)—Ibrahim Rugova, leader of ethnic Albanians in the Yugoslav autonomous province of Kosovo, today said that "ethnic Albanians will participate only as a nation in a referendum at which Yugoslavia's fate is to be decided."

According to the 1981 census, there are over 1,700,000 ethnic Albanians in Yugoslavia and over 1,200,000 in Kosovo, alone, where they account for over 77 percent of the population.

"If citizens vote in the referendum, ethnic Albanians, themselves, shall do so," Rugova, leader of the Democratic Union of Kosovo, said.

Rugova set out that, "if nations in the the individual republics are to vote in the referendum, the ethnic Albanians will organize their own referendum and themselves decide their fate."

"If they do not want the province of Kosovo, they will have a republic of Kosovo, or something else," Rugova warned.

Ethnic-Albanian separatists have been demanding since 1981 that Kosovo be given the status of a republic, which would give it the right to secede.

A referendum on Yugoslavia's future order was proposed by the presidents of Yugoslavia's six republics at the third round of their talks at Brdo Kod Kranja last week.

Macedonian Social Democracy Party Changes Name

LD2004210391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1648 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Summary] Skopje, 20 Apr (TANJUG)—The 11th congress of the Macedonian League of Communists-Party for Democratic Transformation [Savez Komunista Makedonije-Partija z Demokratski Preobrazaj] decided in Skopje this evening to rename this party the Social Democratic Alliance of Macedonia [Socijaldemokratski Savez Makedonije - SDSM]. The new party statute, approved today, among other things abandons the system of democratic centralism. Branko Crvenkovski, a 28-year-old engineer, was elected chairman of the SDSM following a secret ballot.

Chamber Asks Republics To Abolish Blockades

LD2004022591 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1813 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—The Yugoslav Chamber of Economy today sent an [words indistinct] the federal parliament to ask all the republics to abolish regulations which block the functioning of the country's single economic market.

The Yugoslav Chamber of Economy urged [words indistinct] consensus be reached as soon as possible on measures of the economic policy, so as to stop negative economic trends in the country.

The Yugoslav Chamber of Economy also sent the parliament its own proposal of economic measures for this year, which should enable solvency of the economy.

This can be achieved by reducing expenditure, a slower increase of salaries, "clearance of internal debts" and financial discipline, it is said in the proposal. This would stop the drop in production which is around 10 percent this year.

The Yugoslav Chamber of Economy also proposed a money and credit policy which will protect the national currency, the dinar, and create conditions for a revival of the money market.

A realistic rate of exchange of the dinar should be kept im foreign economic relations. Export should be promoted, conditions of foreign payments determined and problems of outstanding foreign debts settled.

The proposal of the Yugoslav Chamber of Economy also said that Yugoslavia should have a program to protect domestic production, just like the Western countries.

1991 Federal Budget Reaches 138 Billion Dinars

LD1904202391 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1149 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 19 (TANJUG)—The national budget will amount to 138 billion dinars (9.2 billion U.S. dollars) this year, TANJUG has learned

The budget proposal, discussed at the Federal Government session yesterday, will be submitted to the Federal Assembly, together with the government's latest package of measures for the functioning of the federation until agreement is reached on a new organization of the country, TANJUG learned.

The new proposal, compared with the initial one of last December, which was not adopted by the Federal Assembly, has been reduced by 7.7 billion dinars.

The biggest item—68 billion dinars—pertains to the Yugoslav People's Army, inclusive of military pensions.

The budget item for support to the economy will be 34.8 billion dinars and for social programs—2.2 billion dinars.

The federation is now being financed temporarily, since the federal units failed to adopt the initial budget proposal

Dinar Devaluation Expected To Increase Inflation

LD2004170591 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1615 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 20 (TANJUG)—Branko Maric, assistant Yugoslav trade secretary, today said that the latest devaluation of the national currency, the dinar, by 44.4 percent would directly increase inflation by 11 to 12 percent.

Explaining the changes in the federal government economic programme, which were presented by federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic in the federal parliament yesterday, Maricic told a news conference that the annual inflation rate in Yugoslavia for 1991 would stand at between 60 and 70 percent.

The inflation rate for 1991 was initially planned to range somewhere between 30 and 40 percent.

Assistant Federal Trade Secretary Maricic said that the main blow of yesterday's devaluation of the dinar was to be expected in June. He said the federal government expected prices to be stabilized in the second half of the year.

The federal government estimates that the monthly inflation rate is to be lower in April than March, when it stood at 3.2 percent.

If today's 35-percent increase in the prices of oil derivatesis taken into account, as Assistant Trade Secretary Maricic said, another 2.5 percent should be added to the anticipated inflation rate for the month of April.

IMF Approves Markovic's Economic Program

LD2004143291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1412 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] Belgrade, April 20 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic has received a letter from Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund Jean-Michel Camdessus, in which the IMF's full readiness to support the Markovic government's programme of economic stabilization and reforms is expressed.

The letter, which arrived in Belgrade yesterday, expresses satisfaction with the package of new measures the Markovic government has announced it will take to stabilize the economy, as the federal government information service has reported.

Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic presented the new economic policy measures for this year in the federal parliament yesterday.

IMF Managing Director Camdessus feels that, since the deterioration of the economic situation in Yugoslavia has been effected by the erosion of an efficient control of the monetary, fiscal and income policies, the new package of measures must insist on the solution of the respective issues with the full and direct support of authorities of the Yugoslav republics, as reported.

The Yugoslav daily BORBA today carries a report from its Washington correspondent and other details in connection with the IMF managing director's letter to the Yugoslav prime minister.

BORBA writes that the realization of a new stand-by arrangement for the restructuring of the Yugoslav economy is announced in the letter.

The daily writes that one billion dollars are involved, including 300 million dollars as compensation for the damages Yugoslavia has suffered directly or indirectly due to the Gulf war.

BORBA's Washington correspondent writes that the talks on the new stand-by arrangement have practically been completed. The daily says that the IMF managing director insists in the letter sent to Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic that, in view of the bad experiences in the past, all Yugoslav republics must oblige themselves that they will bear political responsibility for the implementation of a single Yugoslav monetary policy and will support the implementation of that policy.

BORBA emphasizes the importance of the new stand-by arrangement with the IMF, and sets out that arrangements with other world financial institutions directly depend on it.

Yugoslav Prime Minister Markovic indicated in Parliament yesterday that Yugoslavia could get "additional funds from abroad of between five and six billion dollars."